



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2022

No. 102

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, every good and perfect gift comes from You alone. For with You, there is no variation or shadow of turning. May we place our hope in You and never forget how You have sustained us in the past.

Lord, give our Senators the wisdom to trust You in the small things, realizing that faithfulness with the least prepares them for fidelity with the much. May they trust You to do what is best for our Nation and world during these challenging and turbulent times.

And, Lord, bless Ukraine.

We pray in Your matchless Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a

Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUJÁN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2021—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3967.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3967) to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Tester-Moran amendment No. 5051, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 5065 (to amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5076 (to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, American families are being crushed by a giant backdoor inflation tax, and it

has been fueled, in large part, by Democrats' huge mistakes.

Month after month, families pick up the newspaper, flip on the television, and hear that Democrats' inflation is setting new 40-year records.

Month after month, families find themselves shelling out hundreds upon hundreds of extra dollars per month just to actually tread water. Forget about saving and getting ahead.

In this Democrat-run economy, working Americans have to shell out hundreds of extra dollars every month just to remain standing still. Even when you factor in the nominal pay raises that workers have earned, the average American worker got a 3.9 percent pay cut—pay cut—last year due to Democrats' inflation.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, inflation cost the average American household \$635 last month alone—\$635 in 1 month.

For families in Colorado, combined effects of Democrats' inflation and higher household spending put that number at a staggering \$825. In Arizona, it is \$733 extra per month. In Nevada it is \$731. For New Hampshire families, it is \$653. It is \$599 in Washington State, and \$598 in Georgia.

Everybody knows why this is. Food costs are up more than 10 percent, year on year. Gas is up nearly—listen to this—50 percent. Rent is at a 35-year high, and would-be home buyers are being squeezed between high prices and soaring interest rates.

In my home State, Kentucky, that monthly inflation bill comes out to more than \$500 every month.

Right before Senate Democrats spent \$2 trillion last spring, the Democratic leader said he wasn't worried—wasn't worried—about the possibility of inflation. Now, working families are paying dearly for that incredibly bad judgment.

I hear from hard-working Kentuckians who are falling behind on home payments or late on their utility bills

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2947

or cutting back at the grocery store, families who are skipping—literally skipping—summer vacation.

Every month, the average Kentucky household now spends over \$500 more than they did before the Biden Presidency.

One of my constituents from Beaver Dam wrote to tell me:

Things are looking pretty grim for me and my family right now. Everything—

Everything.

—is too expensive.

His family was already giving up buying chicken and beef at the grocery store. Next they may have to stop making car payments. They are literally out of slack.

Another constituent from Science Hill told me that his family is maxing out credit cards to stay above water. He is watching as the Democrats who control Congress continue—continue—to advocate for more reckless spending and laments that Washington does not appear to understand what is happening—what is happening—to our heartland.

A third constituent from Paint Lick is struggling because—clarifies that she is not asking for a handout because she doesn't believe it would help. "After all," she writes, "money is not free; taxpayers must pay it back." If only Washington Democrats had that much wisdom. If only our one-party government had exercised that much common sense back last spring.

Three of the most basic duties that any government owes its citizens are stable prices, public safety, and secure borders—stable prices, public safety, and secure borders.

Unfortunately for our country, the Democrats have struck out—struck out—swinging.

POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Mr. President, now on a completely different matter, yesterday marked 5 years since the attempted assassination of numerous Congressmen on a baseball field across the river.

The perpetrator was a far-left activist who doublechecked that it was Republicans on the field before he started shooting.

Five years on, political violence and threats are again making national headlines. The far left has spent weeks fomenting rage and panic over the possibility that one or more upcoming Supreme Court rulings may not deliver the liberal policy outcomes they would prefer.

Last week, the authorities arrested a deranged person who traveled to Washington from California with a premeditated plan to assassinate an Associate Justice for ideological reasons—fruit of a toxic culture that is fueled by the precedent-breaking leak of a draft opinion last month and a torrent of reckless talk from prominent Democrats.

It took that assassination attempt and then another week of wasted—wasted—time for House Democrats to

stop slow-walking a bipartisan bill to beef up Supreme Court security that passed the Senate unanimously more than a month ago. The same people—the same people—fanning the flames of fear and anger blocked that non-controversial bill for more than a month—more than a month—before they finally sent it to the President.

Meanwhile, as mobs continue to mount angry demonstrations outside these Justices' private family homes, President Biden's Department of Justice continues to assiduously ignore—ignore—the fact that this is totally illegal now under existing law. Section 1507 of the Criminal Code makes it perfectly clear: It is flat-out illegal to demonstrate at a judge's private family residence to pressure them in a pending case. That is the fact set that we have here. It is not just immoral; it is not just civically toxic; it is literally a Federal crime.

Where is Attorney General Garland? As the former chief judge of the DC Circuit, he should understand the need for judicial security and independence as well as anyone. But the same soft-on-crime ethos that pervades the modern Democratic Party apparently extends even—even—to ignoring illegal pressure campaigns aimed at Federal judges.

Two years ago, a New Jersey judge had a gunman show up to her front door in disguise and murder her son. Just recently, somebody murdered a retired judge in Wisconsin, and then last week's near assassination. But where is President Biden? He won't even denounce the ongoing protests at Justices' private homes, and our supposedly nonpolitical Attorney General will not lift a finger—a finger—to enforce existing Federal law.

Today, every Republican member of the Judiciary Committee and I are sending another—another—letter to Attorney General Garland. His dereliction of duty on this subject must come to an end.

The far-left political violence and intimidation efforts do not stop with judges. In the weeks since the draft opinion suggested the Court may—may—overturn an abortion decision that even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg acknowledged was poorly reasoned, a spate of vandalism, threats, and even some arson attacks have been unleashed upon Catholic churches—upon Catholic churches—and pro-life crisis pregnancy centers all around the country. In 2022, simply being a Christian or being pro-life seems to be sufficient cause for angry radicals to call in threats, graffiti your door, or firebomb your office. Once again, President Biden and his Justice Department have been totally silent—not word about any of it; unable to even simply denounce the hatred.

The same Democrats who want to make a national spectacle out of their supposed opposition to political violence will not even call out violence and intimidation from their own side,

let alone—let alone—fulfill their oaths and put a stop to it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

H.R. 3967

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we continue a productive week here on the Senate floor.

Today, the Senate will take another step closer to passing the largest veterans' healthcare bill in decades, the Honoring our PACT Act. In a few moments, the Senate will vote to adopt the substitute amendment and then immediately vote on cloture on the bill, bringing us to the brink of passing this long-sought piece of legislation.

Frankly, the Senate should come to an agreement to finish the PACT Act work A-S-A-P. We should pass this bill as soon as we can and finally tell our veterans that the long wait for their well-earned benefits is over.

Let me say it again.

There is no reason not to finish the PACT Act A-S-A-P. Our Nation's veterans have waited long enough for this bill. Since 9/11, nearly 3.5 million veterans have been exposed to toxic burn pits in the line of duty. Scores of Americans went off to serve our country in perfect health only to come back home and get sick from toxic exposure, and when many of these veterans applied to the VA for healthcare benefits, they oftentimes discovered that they didn't qualify.

It is a confounding indignity for our Nation's heroes to sacrifice everything for our country only to come home, get sick, and discover that the VA ain't there for them—they have to fend for themselves.

What kind of message does it send to future veterans when we can't guarantee they will get the healthcare benefits they rightfully deserve and when the VA will not deal with injuries that occurred on the battlefield because of toxic burn pits and other issues? With the PACT Act, we have a chance to answer that question with a resounding yes.

Question: Well, if I enlist, am I going to really be taken care of when my service is complete?

We are going to have a chance to answer that question with a resounding yes. Yes, we will take care of you. Yes, we will make sure you can live healthy and dignified lives. Yes, we will keep our promise to protect our veterans just as they have sacrificed everything for us.

No great nation can dare afford to turn its back on the multitudes who have served our country. No veterans

should ever have to carry the burden of treating complications from toxic exposure all by themselves, and we can change that simply with a vote on this bill.

Let us pass the PACT Act with all due haste. We have a moral obligation in the Chamber to get this done.

NOMINATIONS

Now, Mr. President, on the nominations front, we are moving ahead with confirming President Biden's critical and well-qualified nominees.

Later today, we will vote on the confirmation of Alan Leventhal to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Denmark.

Later this week, once we conclude the PACT Act, we will also move forward on the nomination of Mary Boyle for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, whose confirmation would give that Agency a Democratic majority.

We will also soon vote to confirm another historic judicial nominee, Ana Isabel de Alba, to serve as a district judge for the Eastern District of California. Judge de Alba will be the first ever Latina to serve as a Federal judge in California's Eastern District, joining the more than 65 qualified judicial nominees that this majority has confirmed under President Biden.

I am proud of the historic progress this Senate Democratic majority has made in confirming well-qualified and diverse nominees to the executive branch, to independent boards, and to the Federal bench, and we are going to keep going.

GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on gun safety, Democrats and Republicans continue negotiations over the legislative text for the first major gun safety bill to pass the Senate in 30 years.

Just a few weeks ago, such an effort would have seemed unimaginable. If there were any issue that encapsulates the gridlock of the past few decades, gun safety would be near the very top of the list. For too long, Americans have gotten used to a frustrating pattern—tragedy strikes; families grieve; but gridlock in the Senate ensues.

Perhaps this time—hopefully, this time—it will be different. Many in this Chamber are working, right now, in the hopes that it will be different. We are not over the finish line yet, but there is a real hunger to finally accomplish what has escaped the Senate for far too long: passing meaningful gun safety reform.

Again, not too long ago, this debate would have been hard to have fathomed, but despite the long odds, we gave negotiators space to do their work. I am glad we did because we now have the best chance in decades to act on gun violence. I spoke to both Senators MURPHY and CORNYN this morning. They are eager to get the text completed. There will be meetings all day long in the hopes that we can get the text done so we can put it on the floor as soon as possible and get it passed. If we can prevent even one

death from gun violence in the future, our efforts at this moment will have been worth it.

Gun safety is near and dear to my heart. As the Acting President pro tempore knows, three decades ago, I was a proud author of the Brady Bill in Congress, which won the support of many Republicans and even law enforcement. Back then, I argued we had to get something done because the American people were sick and tired of the insanity and inaction of gun violence as much as they are today. After years of trying, we succeeded back then, but it wasn't on the first try. Yet we enacted a bill that, very likely, saved tens of thousands of lives. There are many, many people—thousands or tens of thousands in all likelihood—walking the streets today because we passed the Brady Law.

Today, the American people are similarly sick and tired of the insanity of the gun violence happening every day across the country. Just thinking about all of the shootings we have suffered over the years is exhausting and debilitating: Columbine, Virginia, Sandy Hook, Parkland, Las Vegas, Orlando, El Paso, Charleston, Atlanta, Buffalo, Uvalde. The list keeps going on and growing. The American people have had enough. They want us to move forward.

If the Senate can come up with a bill that embraces the bipartisan framework, we are going to save lives. I promise that, once the text is done, I will put it on the floor as soon as possible, so I encourage my colleagues to keep working. As I mentioned, our Senators on both sides of the aisle will be working diligently all day to try and come up with the final text as soon as possible. We don't know the next time we will have a chance to make meaningful progress on gun violence, so we have every reason in the world to get to yes.

ELECTIONS

Mr. President, on the elections of last night and election deniers, a year and a half after the 2020 election, Donald Trump's Big Lie is alive and well, unfortunately.

Last night, hard-right candidates who believe the last Presidential election was stolen—it is so incorrect, with no factual basis. But these people with these beliefs were elevated into the general election. Many of these candidates are running in critical swing States and running for offices that will have outsized influence in managing future elections.

The example of Nevada's secretary of state race is especially bone chilling. Jim Marchant—a far-right radical, who openly believes that the 2020 election results were illegitimate, who believes the Big Lie—is now running to be the top elections official in Nevada. Mr. Marchant is someone who openly thinks Donald Trump should be the President right now, and if he wins in November, he will be Nevada's most important election official and would

pose a direct threat—a direct threat—to the democratic process in that State.

He must be rejected by the people of every political persuasion. It doesn't matter if you are a Democrat or a Republican or an Independent, a liberal or a conservative or a moderate. Democracy is at risk if we elevate individuals who don't believe in the sanctity of elections. That is the road to authoritarianism, to dictatorship. This isn't a partisan argument. Undermining democracy endangers all of us—Democrats, Republicans, Independents. If the proponents of the Big Lie are elected to office, they pose a direct threat to our democratic way of life.

The January 6 hearings have made it abundantly clear that even Donald Trump's inner circle knew the Big Lie was utter garbage, so it is nothing short of horrifying to see that radicals who profess the Big Lie are gaining strength across the country.

I urge the American people to reject the credo of lies pushed by Donald Trump and his cronies and, whatever your party, to vote this November for men and women who will safeguard our democracy and preserve the sanctity of our elections. Without it, our country could be on the road to ruin.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 4409 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 3967

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the bipartisan accomplishment by the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and the expanded support we are delivering for veterans living with illnesses as a result of toxic exposure due to their service in our Nation's uniform through the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022. This legislation ensures veterans who need help now can get it. We are all too familiar with the challenges that exist for veterans as a result of toxic exposure.

I have been working to improve veteran services and benefits for more than 20 years as a member of both the Senate and the House VA Committees. During that time, I have heard a lot about toxic exposure issues and have come to understand the immediate need to make improvement to benefits and care for post-9/11 veterans who were exposed to toxic substances as a result of burn pits. This exposure is known to cause serious illness, including rare cancers and respiratory ailments. Those suffering deserve to know they have not been forgotten and their voices have been heard.

The promise our Nation made to the men and women who served in these dangerous conditions must be kept. This bill fulfills that promise and delivers immediate access to healthcare for toxic-exposed veterans. It directs the VA to evaluate diseases for presumption of service connection and streamlines the process for toxic-exposed veterans seeking disability compensation for their illnesses without overwhelming the VA system. The Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson PACT Act also invests in the tools and resources to help the VA process disability claims in a timely manner and deliver quality healthcare to veterans living with toxic exposure illnesses.

With this measure, we continue to correct past failures of the VA to provide healthcare and benefits to previous generations exposed to Agent Orange as well. These challenges have existed for decades, and it is time we fulfill our promise to Vietnam-era veterans once and for all.

The legislation we are poised to approve updates VA policies to provide veterans like Bill Rhodes of Mena, AK—a marine who served in Thailand during the Vietnam war era—provide them access to the care he and the others who served in that area deserve. Mr. Rhodes has been a relentless advocate of toxic exposure benefits.

The VA accepts that herbicides were used along the perimeter of military bases in Thailand but does not recognize the impact of the herbicides inside the perimeter. This current policy makes no sense and is not fair, preventing veterans like Mr. Rhodes from accessing benefits as a result of toxic exposure.

After developing illnesses linked to herbicide exposure, Mr. Rhodes turned to the VA for help, but his claim was denied. I have been working with him for several years to advance a provision that corrects this mistake, and I am pleased that this act eliminates the bureaucratic hurdles that have stood in the way of veterans getting the care they earned.

This legislation is the result of bipartisan cooperation. We can achieve great things for our country when we put partisan politics aside. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman TESTER and Ranking Member MORAN to get this bill to the Senate floor. I am proud to work with them to address these press-

ing needs that face our veterans and their families.

I would also like to recognize and thank the countless veterans, the families, advocates, and veteran service organizations that continued their persistence to ensure Congress fulfills its promise to the men and the women who served in our Nation's uniform.

This legislation is long overdue. We have heard the struggles of veterans and their families living with toxic exposure-related illnesses. We can end the hurdles they experienced and save lives by passing this landmark legislation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Montana, Senator TESTER, for up to 5 minutes, prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to address the U.S. Senate and the American people.

In a few moments, the Senate will vote on the Tester-Moran Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our PACT Act.

For far too long—way far too long—our Nation's veterans have been living with chronic illnesses as a result of exposures during their time in uniform. Today, we are continuing to take the steps necessary to right this wrong with our legislation that will provide veterans and their families with the healthcare and benefits that they have earned and that they deserve.

In March, Secretary McDonough testified before our committee, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and he stated that the House toxic exposure bill needed additional work before being brought to the full Senate for a vote. Because of the improvements we have made in the House bill, the VA Secretary yesterday told our committee that he can now "certify" this legislation will be implemented without negative operational impacts on existing disability claims and healthcare for veterans.

All along, I have had concern about the consequences of this legislation and the volume of cases that the VA will now encounter, what it may mean for those veterans as well as veterans who need VA care and benefits who are not toxic-exposed. Secretary McDonough yesterday went on to say: "We're ready for it, we've been pre-

paring for this. . . . I think we can do this and do it well and in all cases do it transparently."

While I appreciate the Secretary's assurance, our committee must continue its oversight of the VA and make certain that this bill is implemented correctly and that all those with toxic exposure and all veterans can rely upon the system for benefits and for healthcare. We still have our work cut out as a Congress, as a Senate, to make sure that the promises that are made in this bill are promises that are kept and that the promises that are made to other veterans are kept.

This bill is designed to fix a broken system that has been cobbled together over decades of patchwork fixes. Congress has been trying to solve these problems. The Department of Veterans Affairs has been trying to solve these problems. Finally, we bring together a solution that should make things significantly better for many.

While I continue to insist my GOP colleagues should be allowed to offer and debate and to vote on amendments, it is time to advance the Tester-Moran substitute and bring us one step closer to connecting all generations of toxic-exposed veterans with the care they need and they deserve and to provide veterans with certainty and support.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks by expressing my appreciation for Ranking Member MORAN's leadership. It has been stellar. If you combine him with Senator BOOZMAN and Senator HEINRICH, it has been a great team. I just want to thank Senator MORAN for his leadership and his continued desire to do the right thing for the servicemembers who have served this country in the military.

The Senate has a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity today to make history in passing the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act.

Let me be clear. This bill isn't about Democrats versus Republicans. It is not about political posturing. It is about Americans standing up for those who have served and sacrificed on behalf of this country and the freedoms that we have today. In fact, it is even more than that. It is about righting a wrong that has been ignored for too damn long.

It is about Will Thompson, who served our country for 23 years in the Army on Active Duty as a West Virginia National Guardsman.

After his second tour in Iraq in 2009, Will developed pulmonary fibrosis from the effect of his exposures to burn pits, and he endured two double-lung transplants. He testified in front of our committee, less than a year ago. He lost his battle with his illnesses this last December.

It is about SFC Heath Robinson, who answered the call of duty and was deployed to Kosovo and Iraq with the

Ohio National Guard—a picture of Heath right here and his daughter.

While deployed, he was exposed to potent toxins, and 13 years after his deployment—13 short years after his deployment—he lost his life to a rare autoimmune disease and stage IV lung cancer, conditions absolutely and unequivocally caused by burn pits.

Sadly, it is too late to do right by Will and Heath and so many others for them personally, but today this body has a chance to do the right thing by their families and future generations of our All-Volunteer military by advancing the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our PACT Act.

I want to talk a little bit about this plaque right here, see the picture of Heath in uniform? But you also see what is the most important thing to Heath, and that is his daughter. His daughter was at a press conference that the ranking member and I were at a little over a week ago. And I said this when I first spoke on this bill a little over a week ago, the first words out of her mouth were: “I love my daddy. Daddy’s not around anymore.” But because of, hopefully, the work that we are going to do here today, she will have a future.

This is not only about our service men and women—the people who served in our military—it is about their families because when folks go to war, it is just not the service person who does it; it is everybody in their family.

And what this bill will do, is it will address decades of inaction and failure by our government, expanding eligibility for VA healthcare to more than 3.5 million combat veterans exposed to burn pits. It supports our post-9/11 and Vietnam-era veterans by removing the burden of proof for 23 presumptive conditions caused by toxins.

These conditions include cancers to lung disease, and it establishes a framework for the establishment of future presumptions and service connections related to toxic exposure, giving the VA the tools it needs to bolster its workforce, establish more healthcare facilities, and improve claims processing.

There is always a cost to war, and that cost is never fully paid when the war ends. Our country didn’t live up to its promise to veterans like Will Thompson and Heath Robinson, but if we do what Senator MORAN and I have done, and that is put politics aside, if we put our American men and women’s bravest first, if we can begin settling our debts to millions of other veterans and their families by getting this bill across the finish line, we will have done something great.

And I would urge my colleagues to support this final procedural vote and a vote that is critical to moving this bill forward.

AMENDMENTS WITHDRAWN

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining pending amendments be withdrawn, with the

exception of the substitute amendment No. 5051.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. TESTER. I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 5051

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All postcloture time has expired.

The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 5051.

Mr. TESTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Baldwin	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Ossoff
Bennet	Graham	Padilla
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hagerty	Portman
Booker	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Brown	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sanders
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Kaine	Schatz
Casey	Kelly	Schumer
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	King	Shaheen
Cooms	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Stabenow
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	Markey	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young

NAYS—15

Blackburn	Lee	Shelby
Burr	Lummis	Sullivan
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Tillis
Johnson	Romney	Toomey
Lankford	Scott (SC)	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—1

Wicker

The amendment (No. 5051) was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jon Tester, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Kyrsten Sinema,

Mark Kelly, Christopher Murphy, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Jeanne Shaheen, Mazie Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 3967, the bill to improve healthcare and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Murphy
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murray
Blumenthal	Graham	Ossoff
Blunt	Grassley	Padilla
Booker	Hagerty	Peters
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Braun	Hawley	Rosen
Brown	Heinrich	Rubio
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Capito	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Hoeven	Schumer
Carper	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kelly	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cotton	Lujan	Warner
Cramer	Manchin	Warnock
Cruz	Markey	Warren
Daines	Marshall	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Merkley	
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—23

Blackburn	McConnell	Shelby
Burr	Paul	Sullivan
Crapo	Portman	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Tillis
Johnson	Romney	Toomey
Lankford	Rounds	Tuberville
Lee	Sasse	Young
Lummis	Scott (SC)	

NOT VOTING—1

Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 23.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

JUNETEENTH

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, on Monday, these Chambers will be empty, but our hearts will be full because we will be joining the American people in commemorating a historic moment in our Nation’s story—Juneteenth, the formal end of slavery in the United States.

One year ago today, we stood together, across party lines, to pass this legislation to memorialize this important day as a Federal holiday. Though we celebrate this anniversary today, on

Monday, communities across our Nation have been marking Juneteenth for more than 150 years.

The celebration of Juneteenth dates back to June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger traveled to Galveston, TX, with the announcement that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were now free.

This was 2½ years after the date of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. Either the news of Lincoln's order had not reached many, including those in Texas, or local officials refused to enforce the Emancipation Proclamation.

Decades later, I introduced, along with my partners in service, Senators CORY BOOKER and TINA SMITH and Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act to honor the day that these Americans took their first steps into freedom and finally made Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

On June 17, 2021, I was honored to stand with Vice President KAMALA HARRIS, Senator SMITH, Representative JACKSON Lee, Senator CORNYN, Senator WARNOCK, and Ms. Opal Lee, while President Biden signed the National Juneteenth Independence Day Act into law.

And why do I mention Ms. Opal Lee? Well, because she is the grandmother of the Juneteenth movement, who fought for years to make Juneteenth a Federal holiday, from Fort Worth, TX, an activist, an educator, who walked 2½ miles every day, fighting for the United States to finally have Juneteenth a Federal holiday. And at the age of 94, she saw that become a reality in the White House.

And in doing so, Juneteenth finally took its rightful place amongst other Federal holidays so that all Americans in all States can celebrate Juneteenth just like they celebrate Memorial Day. The same way they celebrate Martin Luther King Day, they now celebrate Juneteenth.

Juneteenth is a holiday that requires us to remember, reflect, and recommit to the principles that undergird our Nation, liberty and justice for all, but that we have never fully embodied.

We continue to strive to live up to these principles today. Systemic discrimination and mistreatment of Black and Brown Americans still permeates our society—from our criminal justice system to our schools, to our healthcare systems, that is why it is so important that we can learn from our past and honor the heroes in our history who have bent the moral arc of our Nation toward justice.

We face a long road toward justice and equality in the United States, and for us to move forward, that path must be lit with the recognition of our Nation's history.

Juneteenth is our Nation's history. Disparities and injustices reflect the unfulfilled promise of a nation built upon the notion that all people are created equal.

And it has roots in our Nation's original sin—slavery—a crime against humanity that we have for far too long failed to fully acknowledge or to address.

In commemorating Juneteenth as a Federal holiday, we will not fulfill our obligation to right all these wrongs or fix what remains broken, but it is the truth of our history. We must read these missing chapters to understand our national story of freedom and independence.

And right now, in red States across the country, extremists don't want us to learn from our own history. They are burning books and threatening schoolteachers in an attempt to stop our young people from understanding our Nation's past and how it sheds light on our present.

These extremists are afraid that learning about our Nation's history, including many dark chapters as well as the many triumphs, is a threat. And instead of empowering our children to learn from their example, they wish to silence the stories of the brave women and men who have fought for racial equality, and those who continue to fight today follow in that tradition.

Critics say that this discourse will divide us, but that couldn't be less true. More than 150 years since the freeing of the last slaves in America, our Nation stands at a crossroads on our path to racial justice and equality.

We must recognize our wrongs, acknowledge the pain, acknowledge the suffering of generations of slaves and their descendants, and understand the structures of inequity that continue to oppress communities of color and, importantly, learn how the freedom fighters of yesterday and today embody the truest values of our Nation.

We have them to thank for our march toward a more perfect Union, but there is more work to be done. As Ms. Opal Lee said when talking about Juneteenth as a unifier, "I truly believe that we can do so much more together rather than apart."

Together, thanks to the work of this Chamber and so many Americans across our Nation who have fought to tell the full story of our past, Americans will commemorate Juneteenth on Monday.

In doing so, we will join with one another in honoring our past and recommitting to the work which lies ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on Sunday, a bipartisan group of Senators announced principles for addressing the concerns over shootings like occurred in Uvalde, TX, 3 weeks ago, and other places as well.

And I would say we have been making good progress, but we have run into a couple of bumps in the road that have slowed things down a little bit.

One of them is over crisis intervention programs, something we agree is

very important. I believe that we ought to put every State in the position of seeking and receiving funds for crisis intervention programs that they have in place already, even if they don't have a red flag law.

"Red flag" has been what has been discussed and discussed many times, but 19 States have red flag laws, but that means 31 States have other crisis intervention initiatives that are designed to address the same problem, which is people who are a danger to themselves and others because of their mental health. It includes things like assisted outpatient treatment programs, drug courts, mental health courts, and veterans courts.

The other issue that we are wrestling with relates to the domestic violence provision and the way nontraditional relationships are handled. We need to define this in a very crystal clear way. It can't be overly broad or open to interpretation. It needs to be something that can actually be applied because we are talking about very serious consequences here.

Of course, with both of these provisions, we must include rigorous due process protections. That is a redline for folks on my side of the aisle.

I know Senator SCHUMER, the majority leader, wants to put this bill on the floor next week, but unless we can resolve these differences over these two provisions and do it soon, hopefully today, then we won't have time to prepare the text so Senators can read the bill for themselves, which we would expect them to do. And so that is going to require some continued work and good faith negotiations on all sides.

The details of these provisions are critical for support from my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will understand, if we continue down this path without resolution, that we are jeopardizing the timetable that the majority leader has set out for us, or we are jeopardizing the likelihood we can get to 60 votes for anything, and we know how hard this is.

I am eager to wrap up our negotiations, but we are not going to cut corners or capitulate for the sole purpose of passing something. I am not willing to compromise on some of my basic principles or throw the Constitution out the window so we can have something we can hold up and say: Look what we did.

There is a bipartisan appetite to get this done—that is good—and I am optimistic about how far we have come, but we are not there yet, and we need to continue and do so quickly to reach an agreement on language so we can then write the text and have the vote.

From the outset, I said I wanted to identify targeted reforms that could have prevented the recent tragedies in Uvalde and elsewhere. That includes stronger mental health resources, which could have helped Salvador Ramos before he became so sick that he killed innocent children, and he

committed suicide, essentially, in the process. That includes school safety measures, which could have prevented the shooter from actually getting inside Robb Elementary School. It includes reforms to prevent violence by criminals and other dangerous individuals.

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System is one of the most effective tools we have to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and people who suffer from severe mental illness, but it is not a perfect system. It is only as good as the information contained in the system.

For example, in 2017, in the shooting in Sutherland Springs—a little town outside of San Antonio, TX, my hometown—what happened there highlighted the gaping hole in the background check system. Despite the fact that the shooter had a long and disturbing history of violence that should have prohibited him from purchasing a gun, he was able to do so because the Air Force in this instance had not uploaded his felony convictions, his domestic violence conviction, or his mental health commitment.

In response to Sutherland Springs, Senator MURPHY and I introduced the Fix NICS Act to ensure that all Federal Agencies accurately and correctly upload the required conviction records on a timely basis.

Yes, this is the same Senator CHRIS MURPHY whom I am working with now to try to achieve success here. We have done it before, and I believe we can do it again. Our bill was signed into law in March of 2018, and in the first 3 years, 11½ million more records were uploaded into the three national databases that the FBI checks. The number of records in one of those databases increased by more than 30 percent alone. So I think I can say with assurance that what we did together in 2018 has saved lives because if it kept a gun out of the hands of somebody who is already prohibited from getting a gun under current law, we will have saved a life—maybe even the life of the shooter. Sixty percent of the gun deaths in America are suicides. But I know we have saved at least those lives and I think many others as well.

But, as the Uvalde shooting demonstrated, there is another hole in the background check system, and that is juvenile records.

Salvador Ramos showed up at the age of 18 and had a clean record as far as the background check system was concerned because it couldn't look back at his troubled history, struggling with mental health and law enforcement problems. So he showed up as if he had been born the day before, and nothing else previously mattered because it wasn't in the background check system.

If there are disqualifying criminal or mental health records, that information should show up in the NICS system. In other words, if there are things in your life that would disqualify you if

you were an adult but that happened before you turned 18, I think that is the information we need and would want to have for purposes of determining who should be able to purchase or possess a firearm. So that wall that prevents the lookback into pre-18-year-old records is obviously a problem.

Four years ago, the Uvalde Police Department received information about two male juveniles, 13 and 14 years old, who were plotting a school shooting for their senior year. That was 4 years ago, and they were plotting a school shooting when they graduated in—you guessed it—2022. Now, there is no way for us to know for sure whether one of those individuals was Salvador Ramos because those juvenile records are not available to us. But I am here to say that if it is not Salvador Ramos, then we have even a bigger problem. If there are two additional, young, 13- and 14-year-old boys out there saying they are going to shoot up the school when they become seniors, we have even a bigger problem.

One of the provisions we are discussing would encourage the States to upload similar relevant juvenile records into the NICS. This is standard practice in some but not all States, and it is easy to see why it is important.

If an 18-year-old is convicted of aggravated assault—a felony—the record will show up in his background check and prohibit him from purchasing a gun, but if a 17-year-old is convicted of the same crime, the record will not necessarily be uploaded into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. If he tries to purchase a gun at 18, the background check is likely to come back clean—again, because the system is only as good as the information in it.

Let me give you another example. An individual can be adjudicated mentally ill on his 17th birthday and actually be civilly committed for multiple months in a mental institution, but that same person could likely purchase a gun at the age of 18 without anything showing up on his record. Existing law prohibits that purchase, but not all the States are sending that information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Those are examples of why it is so important to be able to get that lookback in the pre-18-year-old history for mental health or criminal justice encounters.

This is not actually an expansion of the background check system because it doesn't add any new restrictions to gun ownership, but it would permit the background check system to actually have access to relevant and material information. It is a commonsense step to ensure that the data in the NICS system is accurate.

That is easy enough to say, but we need to ensure this idea would work in practice, and that is exactly what we are examining now.

No. 1, we need to ensure this provision would protect due process of law.

That is a constitutional right that is fundamental. Under current law, anyone who receives a denial has the right to appeal that decision or challenge the accuracy of the record. Of course, those same protections should exist for juvenile records as well.

Secondly, we need to establish an interim plan while these records are being uploaded into the background check system, a process that will take some time.

Now, my colleagues across the aisle suggested a mandatory waiting period for all purchasers under the age of 21, but we didn't agree to that. There is no reason why somebody who passes a background check with all relevant information in the database should be denied the ability to purchase a gun. In fact, we are talking again about a constitutional right. So no mandatory waiting period. But we are looking at extending the investigatory period for juvenile records that are unclear or ambiguous. Let me explain what I am talking about.

Under current law, a person who wants to purchase a gun from their local retailer must complete a background check. We talked about that. In nearly 90 percent of the cases, the background check is resolved almost immediately because these are computerized records. The average processing time is, in fact, less than 2 minutes. In those cases, the seller receives an immediate answer—either the sale can proceed or it cannot.

In the remaining roughly 10 percent of background checks, the system doesn't return a green light or a red light. In short, this happens when there are question marks or other things that need to be inquired about. This could be caused by a number of factors. If the buyer has a common name, the system could pull records on the wrong individual with the same name. It could also be caused by incomplete criminal history records. For example, if somebody was convicted of assault but the record doesn't say whether it was a felony or misdemeanor or in some cases whether the assault was a domestic violence incident, that would have consequences in terms of their ability to purchase a firearm. So further review, further investigation sometimes is necessary to see whether the light should be green or the light should be red.

Under the current law, the FBI has up to 3 business days to complete a background check and give the seller a clean answer on whether the sale can proceed. That is current law, up to 3 days. In many cases, this review that we are talking about adding for persons between 18 and 21—this review can clarify that the sale can proceed, and that is a great thing. That is how we safeguard Second Amendment rights for law-abiding gun owners.

We discussed the idea of extending that investigatory period when there is a question mark surrounding juvenile records. Again, this is the exception to

the rule, where more information is required because the answer that you get is ambiguous or unclear.

Under this enhanced review, an 18-year-old with a clean record would be able to expeditiously purchase a firearm. The extended investigation period would only apply to those rare cases and, again, only for those 18 to 20 for whom the system does not return a clear answer—yes or no, green or red—but, rather, a yellow light.

We believe this is a commonsense and straightforward way to improve the existing background check system without adding new restrictions.

As I said, negotiations are ongoing, but time is of the essence because we need to get to an agreement so we can get text to our colleagues so that the majority leader can bring this bill up on the floor next week after giving everyone a chance to read it and understand it and have their questions answered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 732 and 735; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it has come to my attention recently on a couple of the nominees whom the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission is entertaining—this body has been rife with allegations of abuse of power and a hostile work environment, resulting in several whistleblower complaints. Several of these allegations would have occurred during both Mary Lu Jordan's and Timothy Baker's previous tenures at the Agency.

The Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission was created under the Mine Act, which declared that the industry must view the health and safety and consider it the most precious resource of the miner. The Agency does not have its own Office of Inspector General to review these considerations. I think it probably needs one. This has led to ongoing efforts by both House Oversight and Senate Republicans.

It is important to shine a light on Agencies like this, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, that have little to no oversight currently.

So, until I am satisfied—and I think others as well—that we look into that, that we vet those concerns, and have some type of interim oversight, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I have some remarks on the nominations.

As the Senator from Indiana noted, the two individuals talked about are Timothy "T.J." Baker and Mary Lu Jordan to serve on the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission. Mr. Baker and Ms. Jordan are highly qualified nominees who were nominated last year.

Mr. Baker currently serves as the associate general counsel of the United Mine Workers of America and previously worked for the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, first as an attorney-advisor in the Office of Administrative Law Judges in Pittsburgh and then as attorney-advisor in the Office of the Commissioners in Washington, DC. Mr. Baker is also the son of a coal miner.

Ms. Jordan was appointed as a Commissioner on the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission in 1994 and has served in that capacity almost continuously since then. Her most recent term as Commissioner ended in 2020, and she has since served as senior attorney-advisor at the Commission.

Given their expertise and commitment to public service, both Mr. Baker and Ms. Jordan would be assets to the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission. It is past due that the Senate confirm their nominations. Confirming both would give Democrats a majority on the Commission.

Mr. Baker and Ms. Jordan are among the excellent nominees who have been put forward by the Biden-Harris administration. Nominees like Mr. Baker and Ms. Jordan will help us represent our Nation's coal miners, and I hope we can advance their nominations today.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 3967

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues—Democrats, Independents, Republicans—to seize this opportunity that we have to pass bipartisan legislation to look out for the veterans of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan who are suffering the terrible consequences of exposure to burn pits, toxic fumes, and toxic waste.

When we send Americans to war, caring for them when they return is not a favor, it is not a good deed, it is not a

choice; it is a sacred obligation of the U.S. Government.

I would observe that many of the same Senators who voted to send our forces into harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan are still serving in this body today.

We have a sacred obligation to pass this legislation to ensure that those who served in those conflicts and anywhere around the world in service to the United States, suffering from the effects of exposure to toxins, get the care they need through the VA.

This is about folks like COL David McCracken of Tyrone, GA, an Army Reservist deployed in defense of our country after 9/11. Colonel McCracken made it home from those deployments. He served his country. He did his duty with valor and bravery. But at the age of 45, when otherwise healthy, Colonel McCracken was diagnosed with brain cancer—a rare occurrence at his age—and 11 months later, he was dead, taken from a wife and three children.

This is about folks like Army SGT Jeff Danovich, who fought in Mosul in 2004, where he lived just 100 yards from a burn pit. Like Colonel McCracken, Sergeant Danovich did his duty. He served in combat. He came home to his family, but just 2 years ago, Sergeant Danovich was diagnosed with leukemia. And when he filed for disability with the VA because of his exposure to burn pits, his claim was denied.

Let me just state again that when this government sends its forces into harm's way, caring for them when they return is not a good deed. We don't get extra credit for doing this. It is not a favor; it is our job. And let me remind my colleagues once again that many of you in this body voted to send these men and women into combat.

So Senator TESTER and Senator MORAN have presented us with a bipartisan bill to do what is right and look after the veterans who did their jobs for us when we sent them to do those jobs. Let's do our jobs for them and pass this legislation.

I yield the floor.

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Illinois.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it was 10 years ago today that President Obama walked into the White House Rose Garden and said he had an announcement to make.

He made an announcement which changed the lives of hundreds of thousands of people living in America. He announced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. Now, we call it DACA.

And with that announcement, I joined with, I guess, thousands of young leaders across this country and breathed a sigh of relief.

Over the past decade, DACA has allowed more than 800,000 Dreamers to remain in the only home they have ever known: America. These young people we call Dreamers came to this

country as children, some as young as a few months old. They grew up studying in our classrooms. They grew up befriending our children and grandchildren. They went to church with us, and when they were kids, every morning they stood up in that classroom and pledged allegiance to that flag. And the reason they did it, of course, is they believed it was their flag.

In the years since DACA was announced, a lot has changed in the world. Presidents have come and gone, wars have ended, and a once-in-a-century pandemic has rocked the world.

But in the face of all these changes and upheavals, one thing remains steady, constant, and predictable: the devotion of Dreamers to America. These young people have demonstrated an unwavering commitment to America. They served as our school teachers, first responders, members of the military, essential workers in the pandemic.

More than 200,000 DACA recipients were classified by our government as “essential critical infrastructure workers” during the pandemic—200,000 of them. And, remember, they don’t enjoy the benefit of citizenship yet. Among them are 40,000 healthcare industry workers, doctors, nurses, paramedics.

Over the years, I have come to the floor of the Senate over 125 different times to tell the stories of the Dreamers. These stories show us what is at stake when we consider the fate of DACA and the Dream Act.

Today, I want to tell you the story of Yazmin Ruiz. She is the 130th Dreamer story that I have told on the Senate floor.

This is a photograph of Yazmin.

She arrived in this country at the age of 3, along with her twin sister and her mom. And even though her extended family remained in Mexico, she said she never felt alone growing up in Arizona because “we were surrounded by community.”

But when Yazmin was 16, the family suffered a tragedy that ignited her passion for medicine. Her mother had a stroke, and when the family arrived at the hospital, they were shocked to discover that none of the healthcare providers spoke Spanish.

At a young age, Yazmin, who was grappling with the trauma and fear that her mother might die, was forced to play the role of interpreter and translator to save her mother’s life.

It was at that moment, even as a terrified 16-year-old, that Yazmin resolved to become a healthcare hero if her mom needed her.

She studied hard in high school. She graduated with honors. She made her way to the University of New Mexico, where she earned a bachelor of science in biology and Spanish.

Yazmin then matriculated to the University of New Mexico School of Medicine, but then she hit a speed bump. She discovered that her immigration status was going to stop her from receiving a professional license to

practice medicine. Her dream was interrupted.

What did she do? She said: No way. She wouldn’t accept no for an answer.

She joined a coalition of like-minded students and rallied support in the New Mexico Legislature to change the State law on licensure.

Now Yazmin Ruiz is fulfilling her childhood dream. Every day she delivers care and support to families like her own and offers the guidance that she once sought as a teenager lost in our healthcare system.

Yazmin is in the third year of her general surgeon residency at the University of New Mexico. And at the height of the pandemic, she was deep in the trenches of our healthcare system.

Back in the summer of 2020, when COVID was new and basically unknown, Yazmin was working 80 hours a week, providing daily care to COVID-positive patients, performing CPR, and wearing protective gear from head to toe.

Like so many Dreamers, Yazmin’s commitment to serving her community was unshakeable. Even when her own family members came down with COVID, she didn’t stay home and take care of them. She went to work. Day after day, she put her life on the line to save the lives of others.

And she has continued that journey as a healthcare professional against improbable odds.

Yazmin considers it “a privilege and an honor to serve America in the midst of an unprecedented public health crisis.”

I want to thank Yazmin Ruiz for her service on the frontlines of the coronavirus pandemic. She is an immigrant health hero. She is a DACA health hero. She has put herself and her family at risk to protect American lives. She shouldn’t also have to worry about whether she is going to be deported tomorrow and whether her family will be deported as well.

Think about that for one moment. This young woman, against all the odds, is pursuing her residency in surgery. She is determined to serve this Nation and to make people’s lives better.

And what is our response, our official government response? Sorry. You are not a citizen, and under the current law, you never will be.

So you ask yourself, what are we thinking? If a quality, contributing person like Yazmin Ruiz is willing to defy the odds and to risk everything to be a doctor, why aren’t we applauding that, rewarding that, giving her an incentive and others like her to be a generation of service to America?

Basic question we have to ask, would we be a better nation, a better country, if we deported Yazmin Ruiz? I hope the answer is pretty obvious. It is to me.

Over the past 20 years or more, I have had the privilege of sharing more than 100 stories like Yazmin’s on the floor of the Senate—the stories of Dreamers who have given everything they can to

America and who have more than earned their place in America’s story.

Yet these brilliant young people are still waiting on us, on Congress, to finish the job that President Obama started with DACA. This program was always supposed to be a temporary solution. Ten years ago we knew that. The permanent solution was enacting a piece of legislation that I introduced 20 years ago called the DREAM Act. It provides a path to citizenship for Dreamers, including young immigrants eligible for DACA.

Congress has been on the cusp of passing the DREAM Act for years. In 2013, we included it in a larger immigration package that passed the Senate with 68 votes. It was a glorious day. Can you imagine it—68 votes in the Senate for anything?

And that broad bipartisan support reflected America’s public opinion; that the Dream Act was the right thing to do. In fact, over the years, “Dreamers” have become a household word. When we came up with the name for this legislation over 20 years ago, and you said the word “Dreamers,” people would say: Oh, I know that. That is a rock group, a British rock group, and it might have been Freddie and the Dreamers, but that wasn’t the group we were describing at all.

These Dreamers have touched the hearts of America because in the Dreamers we see our own history as a nation of immigrants. We know that they deserve permanent status in this country, their home. They have earned it, but time and again the Senate has failed DACA recipients.

Instead of making these protections permanent, we have left them in doubt. The former President of the United States, Donald Trump, even attempted to terminate the DACA Program to turn people like Yazmin Ruiz away from the country.

Can you imagine what that would have meant to her, to her family, to New Mexico, to America, for all the Americans whose lives have been saved by Dreamers like Yazmin or for the Nation’s classrooms and businesses that count on these idealistic, hard-working people who want to be part of our future?

And our failure to protect Dreamers is not only a human disaster, it is an economic disaster. It doesn’t add up.

DACA recipients and their households pay more than \$5 billion in Federal taxes, more than \$3 billion in State and local taxes every single year. That is money that funds the construction of roads and bridges, pays Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. And the economic upside of enacting the Dream Act is even bigger.

Last year, the House passed the bipartisan Dream and Promise Act. If the Senate just followed their lead and passed that legislation today, we could increase America’s GDP by more than \$800 billion over the next decade and create hundreds of thousands of jobs in the process.

Our broken immigration system is embarrassing. It is failing America, and it is failing our families. It is also failing our economy. Beyond the Dream Act, Congress on both sides of the political spectrum agree, comprehensive immigration reform would boost our economic growth and help ease inflationary pressures in the United States. The United States Chamber of Commerce even called for doubling the number of legal immigrants in America to address the worker shortage and in turn alleviate inflation. With the Dream Act, we are talking about a bipartisan measure that is very simple in scope. It allows young people who have grown up in America to continue contributing to our economy. For decades now, Dreamers have been stuck in legislative purgatory. Only a subset of them have been able to secure DACA protections, and even for those who do, they have to renew their status every 2 years, which means they can only plan their lives in uncertain 2-year increments. That is unfair. No, it is cruel.

Dreamers are living with the sword of Damocles hanging over their head. In the coming weeks, a Federal judge could strike down DACA and deport these young people to countries they barely remember, if they remember at all. Just last year, a Federal judge in Texas limited the program to only renewing applications. That ruling was wrong. It excluded a whole generation of Dreamers from stepping out of the shadows of a broken immigration system.

If there is one lesson we can learn from the bipartisan gun safety framework that is being debated this week in Washington, it is that the Members of this Senate are not as divided as the American people think. We can come together to support commonsense policies that secure a brighter future for America. That is exactly the opportunity we have with the Dream Act.

I can think of no better way to celebrate the 10-year anniversary of DACA than by finally passing this legislation, offering every one of our amazing Dreamers a path to American citizenship, which they deserve and they have earned. An overwhelming bipartisan majority of voters want Congress to pass the Dream Act. They know it will dramatically grow our economy and strengthen our Nation. Most importantly, it is the right thing to do.

It is time for Congress to step up and meet our responsibility—Democrats, Republicans and Independents alike. Let's get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Vermont.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, at 5:15 this afternoon, we will be voting on a budget resolution written by my colleague Senator RAND PAUL from Kentucky. As chairman of the Budget Committee, I urge a very strong "no" vote.

At a time of a massive incline in wealth inequality, at a time when two people in our country own more wealth than the bottom 42 percent of our population, at a time when the top 1 percent owns more wealth than the bottom 92 percent, at a time when we are looking at more income and wealth inequality than at any time in American history, this budget resolution offered by Senator PAUL would move us in exactly the wrong direction and make a bad situation worse.

Senator PAUL's resolution would make the very wealthiest people in this country even wealthier, while at the same time, it would make tens of millions of middle-class Americans—people in the middle class, people in the working class, lower income Americans—even poorer.

We remain, sadly, the only major country on Earth not to guarantee healthcare to all people as a human right. We pay the highest prices by far in the world for prescription drugs. Half of our people are living paycheck to paycheck, and millions are working at 8, 9, 10 bucks an hour because we still have a disastrous, starvation minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour. Many millions of Americans today, as housing prices soar, are spending half or more of their limited incomes on housing. Forty-five million people in our country are struggling with student debt. At a time when half of older Americans have no savings—people have worked their entire lives, and they have no savings to prepare themselves for retirement. The Social Security benefits that they will receive are inadequate to allow them to live out their remaining years in dignity.

What this budget resolution brought forth by Senator PAUL does is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing. Instead of expanding Medicare to make sure that every man, woman, and child in this country has healthcare as a human right, this is a budget that would lead to devastating cuts to Medicare, cuts to Medicaid, and cuts to other public health programs.

Senator PAUL's budget resolution would cut nutrition assistance at a time when there are children in America today who are going hungry. It would cut Federal aid to education at a time when schools are looking for funding to pay the teachers they need adequate wages. But in the midst of this budget that cuts healthcare, that cuts education, that cuts Social Security, that cuts every benefit needed by ordinary Americans, this is a budget that would give massive tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country.

So you have a situation where, right now, we have a tax system which is broken, which is corrupt, which allows some billionaires in a given year to pay zero in Federal income taxes—zero. Some of the richest people in this country in a given year do not pay a nickel in Federal income tax. We have a tax system which allows dozens of major, profitable corporations making

billions of dollars a year in profit to pay in a given year zero in Federal income tax. We have an effective tax rate today in which billionaires pay a lower effective rate than nurses and firefighters. That is what we have today. Senator PAUL's budget—well, you guessed it. You are right. It would give even more tax breaks to the 1 percent and to the billionaire class.

Unfortunately, the vision of America that Senator PAUL's budget puts forward—balancing the budget on the backs of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor in order to make the richest people in America even richer—is not just the vision of Senator PAUL. I wish it was just his vision, and I have to applaud his honesty for coming forward and putting his vision on paper. Unfortunately, it is the vision of many, many people in the Republican Party, and this is what they want.

Senator PAUL and many in the Republican Party do not believe that it was good enough to provide over \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large corporations, as they did when Trump was President—not good enough. The budget that we are debating today, Senator PAUL's proposal, would make those tax breaks for the wealthy and the powerful permanent—permanent—at a cost of more than \$2 trillion over the next decade, cutting nutrition programs for hungry children, throwing millions of people off of Medicare and Medicaid, but providing \$2 trillion in tax breaks for the very wealthy.

Under Trump, Republicans came within 1 vote of passing a bill that would have thrown up to 32 million Americans off of health insurance and eliminated vital protections for people with preexisting conditions like cancer or diabetes and substantially increased premiums for older workers. That was the bill that the Trump administration tried to get passed. It failed by one vote—the late Senator McCain.

Senator PAUL and many Republicans who support this budget resolution believe that what they tried to do a few years ago in decimating the Affordable Care Act—hey, that didn't go far enough.

So the budget that we are talking about right now, Senator PAUL's proposal, would throw up to 35 million Americans off of Medicaid.

So what do you do in the middle of a pandemic when you have no health insurance? Well, right now, as a nation today, there are estimates that about 60,000 people a year die because they don't get to a doctor on time. Throw 35 million people off Medicaid, that number will escalate. We are talking about tens and tens of thousands of people who would die because they wouldn't have Medicaid, wouldn't be able to go to a doctor when they are sick.

When Donald Trump was in office, he proposed a budget that would have cut Medicare by nearly \$845 billion. Senator PAUL and the Republicans who

will support this budget do not believe that those cuts went far enough—only \$845 billion in cuts to Medicare. The budget we are debating today would cut Medicare by up to \$3.9 trillion over the next decade and throw some 29 million senior citizens and persons with disabilities off of Medicare.

At a time when tens of millions of Americans struggle with hunger, Senator PAUL and the Republicans who support this budget want to cut the SNAP program by \$300 billion, throwing some 13 million people off of that program.

I don't know what a nation stands for if we cannot feed the hungry and if we cannot provide healthcare to people who need it, but that is what this budget does. Overall, Senator PAUL's budget would make \$15 trillion in cuts over the next 10 years, slashing the Federal budget by nearly 40 percent by the end of this decade.

So that is where we are today, Mr. President. And, again, I would reiterate that this is not just Senator PAUL's budget. And I applaud him for his honesty. He is an honest guy; he is a straightforward guy; and he comes forward and he says: This is what I believe.

It would be bad enough if this were just the views of one U.S. Senator. Unfortunately, it is not. These are the views of many in the Republican Party.

So, Mr. President, it is absolutely imperative that this budget proposal of Senator PAUL be defeated and that we move this country forward in a very different direction. It is a direction which says that the U.S. Government should be representing the needs of all of the people, not just the wealthy and the powerful and Big Money campaign contributors. It is a vision in opposition to Senator PAUL that says that healthcare is a human right, that we have to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and cut prescription drug costs in this country in half. It is a vision which says that, no, we should not be cutting Social Security; we should be lifting the cap on taxable income, which today is at \$147,000, meaning that somebody making \$10 million pays the same amount into Social Security as somebody making \$147,000. We should be lifting that cap so that we can increase Social Security benefits for all seniors.

So, Mr. President, this is not just a budget resolution on the part of the Senator from Kentucky, Senator PAUL; this really is a contrasting vision of where we want this country to go. Do we want to move into an oligarchic form of society where a handful of people on top have enormous wealth and enormous political power while, at the same time, the middle class continues to become small and we have more and more people living in poverty?

So these are contrasting visions of the future of America, and I hope very much that Senator PAUL's resolution will be soundly defeated.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

H.R. 3967

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I wanted to talk for just a few minutes, if I could, about a bill that is coming to the floor. It is called the PACT Act. And this is something that those of us at the Veterans' Affairs Committee have worked on for quite a period of time.

And we had worked diligently through what we thought was a prescribed and agreed-to process, and we are finding out that the majority leader is pretty much forcing this issue to the floor this week for a vote. And he is calling it "the most ambitious and important expansion of veteran healthcare benefits that we have seen in decades."

Now, Senators Schumer and Tester have, indeed, put forth a bill that when you look at it, when you hear the intent, a first glance at it, you say: Oh, this is exactly what we need to help our servicemembers.

And, indeed, we all are just so grateful for the men and women who have served in this country, who have worn that uniform. But there is a lot to be said for bringing measures to the floor for passage when they are ready, when there has been agreement on critical importance. As the majority leader said, the biggest expansion of benefits that we have seen in decades.

Now, many of us have worked for quite a period of time on the issue of toxic exposure and have worked on how best to make certain that when we address this, that you are going to get care to the veteran in a timely manner—they are not going to have to wait; they are going to receive the care that they need.

So it is frustrating to me, as it is to many of my colleagues, to think about what could have been accomplished had the majority leader just done what he had promised to do and had allowed a thorough amendment process. We should all share the goal of making certain that legislation we pass that deals with our veterans, that deals with our men and women in uniform, is going to be a promise fulfilled and not a false promise or not a frustration.

Yesterday, at Veterans' Affairs Committee, we had a hearing with our VA Secretary. We have had a terrible problem with case backloads on benefits in health services. Currently, the case backlog is about 188,000. That is the backlog. That is what needs to be worked through. And in passing this bill that is before us today, the estimate is that we are going to add about a million cases to that.

Now, I want you to put yourself in the shoes of a veteran who has suffered and is suffering with toxic exposure and has a rare cancer, has a respiratory disease, a cardiovascular disease, and is needing access to care.

What you want is to be able to get that care. What you don't want to do is have to wait for that care. And that is

why we needed to go through this amendment process: to address this issue of how a veteran is going to be able to access that care in a timely manner when they need the care because with some of these rare diseases, days and weeks and months become a life-or-death issue. So the access is important. The amendments that we proposed were as noncontroversial as you can get in these days.

Now, the amendment that I had, which was one of the two amendments that we were to have on the Republican side—by the way, I said that, two amendments. That is what we were going to be allowed. It wasn't an open amendment process—two amendments, two things that would have improved the bill. I proposed an amendment that would have eliminated arbitrary bureaucratic hurdles for toxic exposed veterans, would have eliminated this from the long wait times at their local VA hospitals and clinics. Basically, it would have been that express pass that they need because it would have allowed them to seek care in the community if they could get it there faster than they could through the VA.

Now, the reason for this is because I spend a lot of time talking with veterans in Tennessee. I have veterans who are a part of our team. They talk to me about the issues that many of their friends and their neighbors are experiencing or people who served in their unit or their battalion and how they need this care.

Right now, if you are in the Nashville area, which is where many of our retirees from Fort Campbell and the 101st go for their care—if you are there and you are going to go to the VA over at Vanderbilt there in Nashville and request an appointment, your wait is 72 days. What if you are a veteran and you have a rare respiratory condition that is caused from a burn pit or from toxic exposure or you have developed a cancer and you are needing care, do you really want to have to wait 2½ months to be able to see a general practitioner for an appointment that will refer you to a specialist?

Do we think that is fair to our veterans? Is that the way to treat them—to say, pick up the phone and call and then we will get you an appointment? By the way, it is going to be 72 days on the wait time, and then we will start the clock to try to get you into community care to get you to a specialist.

My amendment would basically have said veterans can take that card out of their wallet, their VA card—they can show it at a care facility in their community, and they can get the care they need then. You are eliminating wait times for them. You are eliminating long lines. You are eliminating the frustration and the fear and the anxiety that comes as every day you think this cancer is growing, and I am being denied care because of the bureaucratic process. Our veterans ought not to have to deal with that bureaucratic process. They have waited a long time.

So this amendment would have improved the bill. And I have it right here in my hands. It is really very simple. Section 121, "Subtitle C—Other Health Care Matters"—that is what is underneath—"REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CARE UNDER VETERANS COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM FOR TOXIC-EXPOSED VETERANS." And then it goes through, it strikes an "or," inserts a semicolon, strikes the period at the end of the sentence and inserting "or" and adds "the covered veteran is a toxic-exposed veteran."

Pretty specific. It elevates the care that they need so that they do not have to wait because they have waited long enough. And they don't want to have to wait until the VA hires enough people to do this. Right now, if the VA is going to hire new nurses or doctors, do you know how long it takes them to get them hired? Ninety-seven days. Do they have what they need to meet this load? No, they do not.

Now, in the private sector they can make these hires in about 16 days. And they do. And we have discussed these hiring process changes that need to be made in order to facilitate this care.

Now, some have said: Well, you know, if we allow community care, in essence, that is privatizing—privatizing—the VA. No, it is not. It is not privatizing. What it is doing is saying the VA is seeking a better way to deliver a service in a timely manner to the people who have been promised the service. That is what the amendment would do. It would allow them to avoid that bureaucratic process to take that VA card to go get the care they need that day. But, no, because we have some who are so fearful that the VA or the Federal Government might lose some of their power, some of their control over your life, they will not agree to that.

Now, the fiscal year 2021 NDAA included my K2 Veterans Toxic Exposure Accountability Act, requiring a 180-day study by DOD on toxic exposures at K2 to demonstrate more clearly the associations between exposure to toxic substances and negative health consequence experienced by K2 veterans. That is something that had a tremendous effect on many of our military men and women at Fort Campbell and there with the 160th, with the 101st.

And I have worked with Senator TILLIS on the Toxic Exposure in the Military Act, the TEAM Act, which was largely included in the PACT Act. And I worked with Senator SULLIVAN on the Veterans Burn Pits Exposure Recognition Act, which would concede exposure to a list of toxic substances, hazards, and chemicals common to burn pits for veterans who deployed to certain covered locations within certain corresponding periods.

So I thank my colleagues who have put the effort in on this. I will say that I am very disappointed that my colleagues from New York and Montana decided no amendments. Senator MORAN's amendment would have ad-

justed how that wait time is calculated to be more fair to our veterans. My amendment would have allowed them to immediately get the care they need, lifesaving care—lifesaving care. It would have allowed that immediate access. But we have chosen, it appears—or the majority leader and the chairman have chosen—to move forward without an amendment process that would be more fair and more responsive to our veterans. And at the same time, they are daring us to vote no on this bill. I would challenge them.

Take a moment and let's return to the agreed-to amendment process and improve this for the sake—for the sake—and the livelihood of many of our veterans who are experiencing the effects of toxic exposure.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024 THROUGH 2032—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the United States has the largest economy in the world and also has the largest government apparatus in the world. This year, we will bring in \$4.8 trillion and will spend about \$5.8 trillion, and yet we will have no budget this year. How inexcusable, how embarrassing it is for a country—the largest country in the world, the largest government in the world, the largest bureaucracy in the world—to have no budget. Is it any wonder that we are \$30 trillion in debt?

Most small businesses have a budget. Most businesses in our country have a budget and a prediction for what will come in and what will go out for the year, and this year there will be no budget. Not only will there be no Democratic presentation about it, there will be no Republican presentation as a party.

So today I will introduce my budget. This is a budget that balances in 5 years. The reason we chose 5 years is that the constitutional amendment to the budget amendment—the constitutional amendment that would balance the budget—balances in 5 years. We voted on that amendment previously in this body, and the Democrats, in unison, opposed it. They were opposed to a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The Republicans were unanimous in voting for the balanced budget amendment, constitutional amendment. In that amendment, the

text of it would balance the budget in 5 years. So you would think, if all 50 Republicans are on record as being for a balanced budget amendment that balances in 5 years, that all 50 Republicans would be for a balanced budget, a budget that actually balances in 5 years.

Now, why is it important to have a budget? Well, you ought to have a blueprint or a plan for what your government is going to do, so it is inexcusable not to have any budget at all.

But also we have another problem that we are facing in our country: We are facing the problem of inflation. Every American is seeing it. You are seeing your gas prices go through the roof. You are seeing your prices at the grocery store going through the roof.

Why do we have inflation? Well, inflation comes from debt. When the United States runs up a debt, it is sold. Foreign countries buy the debt, Americans buy the debt, but the biggest purchaser of our debt is the Federal Reserve.

When the Federal Reserve buys the debt, do they buy it with money that they have sort of laying around? Do you go to the Federal Reserve, and some guy opens a big safe, and here is the money to buy the debt? No. The Federal Reserve doesn't have any money, so the Federal Reserve simply prints up the money and buys the American debt. But what does that mean? When the Federal Reserve prints the money to buy the debt, this floods the system with money. So we are flooded with money right now. In the last 2 years, we borrowed \$6 trillion, so \$6 trillion is entered into the system.

When you look at the amount of money that is being created, there is a measurement of money supply called the M2. If you look at it on an annualized basis, it has been going up at 15 percent a year.

So inflation is an increase in the money supply. It is an increase in the money supply because they are buying the debt. So it is all related to spending.

It is inexcusable that we will have no budget this year. It is inexcusable that the projection is for a trillion-dollar deficit in 1 year and yet there won't even be a budget plan. There will be no plan to try to make the deficit less or to try to manage our money.

But with this debt comes inflation. We are suffering from the worst inflation we have had in 40 years. Who suffers the most from inflation? The working class, those who are on fixed income, those who are retired, they are getting creamed by this. People are spending over \$100 filling up their gas tank now. This is a real problem.

So a balanced budget is not an academic exercise. It is not something that is theoretical. Our deficit has real impacts. Our deficit is leading to inflation. So what I have proposed for the last several years is a balanced budget, a budget that balances gradually over 5 years by having across-the-board cuts.

When I started introducing this budget several years ago, you could simply freeze spending, and if you froze spending, we would grow out of the deficit. By 5 years, by not increasing spending, you would have a balanced budget. That was rejected by all the Democrats and about half of the Republicans.

So then we went another year or two, and spending increased. As spending increased and got worse, a freeze would no longer balance the budget in 5 years, so we introduced the Penny Plan. The Penny Plan was to cut 1 percent a year for 5 years, and it would balance. But still the Congress ignored my admonition on this, and the spending got worse.

In the last couple of years, it has had to have been increased by a two-penny plan, meaning a 2-percent reduction in spending each year for 5 years would still lead to balance in 5 years. But Congress once again has ignored that.

So last year when we introduced the 5-year plan to balance the budget, it was called the Five Penny Plan. You had to reduce spending by 5 percent each year for 5 years.

This year, it has gotten even worse. The \$6 trillion spending spree of the last 2 years when they locked down the economy and basically bankrupted almost every business in the country—when that occurred, there was massive spending, massive debts, and now, this year, in order to balance the budget, it would take a 6-percent cut.

But I would like to put this in perspective. If you ask people in Washington, their heads explode because they could never conceive of ever reducing spending. In fact, spending hasn't gone down really ever in real terms in recent history because the government grows and grows and grows. Your economy may shrink, your income may shrink, you may be unemployed, but the government gets bigger and bigger and bigger.

So if we want to tame government, if we want to get government to live within its means, if we want government to balance its budget, it would take some work. People in Washington seem to think, oh, it could never happen, but if you talk to a business man or woman who has ever been through a recession or ever been through tough times, they will tell you that sometimes a business has to reduce by 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, to live within their means.

What we are calling for here is not no government. We are not even calling for a minimal government. What we are calling for is a government that lives within its means. Right now, living within its means would be a government that brings in \$4.8 trillion, which is how much tax revenue comes in, would spend \$4.8 trillion. So still the vast majority of things the government does, it could still continue to do, but it would have to spend less. We would have to have real restraint in spending.

The best way to perceive it is this: Imagine the thing that you want from

government that you think is so popular, nobody could touch. Let's take for example research for cancer or research for Alzheimer's disease, something that so many people advocate, so many people are emotionally charged with.

Well, when people come to Washington and they ask me about "I have this" or "My parents have this, and I want research money to go to this," what I typically will say to them is "You know we are out of money. You know that we have this massive deficit, and it has led to this great inflation that is across the land. What if we told everybody that they had to have a little bit less?" They look at me and they say "Well, what would that mean?" and I say "Well, let's say that your research project—the cancer research or the Alzheimer's research—got \$100 million last year. In order for all of us to tighten our belt, in order for all of us to balance the budget so we can be stronger, in order to tame the inflation that is eating us alive, you would get \$94 million next year."

So we are not talking about sort of eliminating whole facets of government; what we are talking about is everybody would have to deal with less.

There is so much waste throughout government. You look at the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation is one of the most wasteful Agencies in government.

You go back 50 years, and you look at William Proxmire. In the early 1970s, William Proxmire began giving an award called the Golden Fleece Award. What he would give an award for was wasteful spending, and almost always, it came to the National Science Foundation. One of the first ones he gave an award for was \$50,000 to discover what makes people fall in love. He just thought it was ridiculous that we would be spending money on that, and I agree. But it didn't get better; it got worse.

The National Science Foundation has never had a reduction in its money. It always gets more money. This year—and this is why this is a bipartisan problem—the Republicans and Democrats got together, and we nearly doubled the income or nearly doubled the appropriations for the National Science Foundation.

What are some other kinds of great research coming out of this organization?

Well, they did a study to see whether or not selfies make you happy. So if you take a selfie of yourself smiling and then look at it later in the day, does that make you feel better about yourself? That would cost a little over a million dollars.

They did a study also on the mating call of male Panamanian frogs. They said: Well, we want to know whether the country frogs have a different mating call than the city frogs. As someone who comes from the country, I can tell you there is a different mating call in the country than there is in the city.

But that cost us about half-a-million dollars.

Another study was \$2 million to find out if the person in front of you sneezes on the food in the cafeteria, are you more or less likely to take that food?

Another study was three-quarters of a million dollars, studying whether or not Japanese quail, on cocaine—whether or not they are more sexually promiscuous when they use cocaine.

I mean, the studies go on endlessly.

So what did Congress do? Instead of telling them: Why don't we give them one penny less; why don't we give them 99 percent of their budget, or this year why don't we give them 94 percent of the budget, instead we gave them 200 percent of their budget. Do you think the National Science Foundation is going to be more frugal now that we have nearly doubled their budget?

But this is the kind of great ideas that are coming out of Congress, and this one turned out to be a bipartisan idea. All of the Democrats and half the Republicans voted to nearly double the size of the National Science Foundation. So you will get more waste, more abuse, and more debt.

The thing is, we bring in a lot of money. We bring in \$4.8 trillion. Could we not simply spend what comes in? Part of the problem also is most of the bills are not read. Most of the appropriations bills come in here at the last moment, are 2,000 pages, and no one gets to read them until hours beforehand.

And so what they do is they have renewed programs year after year. There is a process up here where we authorize spending. So one committee is supposed to say, is the spending working, and then the other committee appropriates the money. We don't even bother to reauthorize these things. We just keep reappropriating the money year after year.

Someone will have this great idea and say, well, we need to do something about homelessness, and everybody will say, well, that is such a well-meaning—they intend to do it, and they will do it. But nobody looks up the fact that we already have 80 other programs doing the same thing.

Nobody ever looks at whether the program is working. Nobody ever figures out whether anything that we are spending on money is viable and doing us any good, and so it just adds up.

People come and say: Oh, well, this is something we have to do. We have to send \$40 billion to Ukraine. Where does it come from? If you really think it is such a great idea, why don't we have a Ukraine war tax? Why don't we do \$500 per taxpayer, and you would have enough for Ukraine. No, they just want to add it on the tab.

But it is worse than that. It is so irresponsible that the party in charge will produce no budget. So we have nearly \$5 trillion coming in; nearly \$6 trillion going out the door, and there will be no budget. It is inexcusable.

We have the largest economy in the world. We have the largest government

in the world, and we will have no budget this year. So what I have done and will continue to do is to produce a budget that balances in 5 years; this is consistent with the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

And the other reason we do 5 years is that some people have come forward in the past and said that we will balance it in 10. It becomes so long and unbelievable with the cuts in years 9 and 10 that they never happen; that it really hasn't become a good document even when budgets are put forward.

I think if we were to balance our budget, I think we would be a stronger Nation. It is the way we would combat inflation. If you see the people representing the party in power, the Democrats, you see them on TV, they are scratching their heads; they have no idea. They are like we have tried everything. But they don't even understand the problem. They have no idea where inflation is coming from.

Inflation comes from debt. When the Federal Reserve buys the debt, that creates the inflation. Because the Federal Reserve has no money, the money is printed up, and the money floods the system.

But it is also part of a bait and switch. These are people who run for office and say: We will bring you free things. We will bring you baubles. We will bring you manna. We will give you free stuff. We all instinctively know that nothing in life is really free.

So the free stuff that they are going to bring to you is paid for through inflation.

So we have to get away from this. We have to get to the point where we say that we are smarter than this. When a politician calls you up and says: Give me your Social Security number and I will send you a thousand dollars, that is what this is. It is an internet scam. It is a phone scam.

They are asking for your vote by saying: We are going to give you free stuff. There is no free lunch. There is nothing in life that you will get without working. But what we have done is political parties and politicians—sometimes in both parties—offer free stuff to people. But right now we are paying the penalty. We are paying the piper. We are paying the inflation tax.

And the inflation tax is a tax because we have overspent. Inflation will continue to get worse until we begin to reduce the debt. You have got to quit digging the hole. We have this massive hole of debt, and we have to quit digging the hole deeper. So this budget will be a budget that balances in 5 years, and I recommend a "yes" vote.

MOTION TO PROCEED

And with that, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. Con. Res. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. Con. Res. 41, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United

States Government for fiscal year 2023 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2024 through 2032.

VOTE ON MOTION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Barrasso	Grassley	Marshall
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Romney
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Ernst	Lee	Tuberville
Fischer	Lummis	

NAYS—67

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Blunt	Inhofe	Sasse
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boozman	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Burr	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cantwell	Leahy	Sinema
Capito	Lujan	Smith
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McConnell	Thune
Collins	Menendez	Tillis
Cooms	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Murkowski	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young
Graham	Portman	
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Daines	Toomey
Moran	Wicker

The motion was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan M. Leventhal, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Denmark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

VOTE ON LEVENTHAL NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Leventhal nomination?

Mr. HEINRICH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Risch
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Kaine	Rosen
Burr	Kelly	Rounds
Cantwell	Kennedy	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Cassidy	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Cooms	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Crapo	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Ernst	Lummis	Tillis
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville
Grassley	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—5

Daines	Toomey	Wicker
Moran	Whitehouse	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Arizona.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 903, Ventris C. Gibson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Mint for a term of five years; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ventris C. Gibson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Mint for a term of five years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gibson nomination?

The nomination is confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN
SEPARATION ACT

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1098, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1098) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KELLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Warner substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5097), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act".

SEC. 2. SEPARATING JOINT CONSOLIDATION
LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 455(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking "A borrower" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A borrower"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) SEPARATING JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—

"(i) AUTHORIZATION.—A married couple, or 2 individuals who were previously a married couple, and who received a joint consolidation loan as such married couple under subparagraph (C) of section 428C(a)(3) (as such subparagraph was in effect on June 30, 2006), may apply to the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, for each individual borrower in the married couple (or previously married couple) to receive a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part.

"(ii) ELIGIBILITY FOR BORROWERS IN DEFAULT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a married couple, or 2 individuals who were previously a married couple, who are in default on a joint consolidation loan may be eligible to receive a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part in accordance with this paragraph.

"(B) SECRETARIAL REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 428C(a)(3)(A) or any other provision of law, for each individual borrower who applies under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

"(i) make a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part that—

"(I) shall be for an amount equal to the product of—

"(aa) the unpaid principal and accrued unpaid interest of the joint consolidation loan (as of the date that is the day before such separate consolidation loan is made) and any outstanding charges and fees with respect to such loan; and

"(bb) the percentage of the joint consolidation loan attributable to the loans of the individual borrower for whom such separate consolidation loan is being made, as determined—

"(AA) on the basis of the loan obligations of such borrower with respect to such joint consolidation loan (as of the date such joint consolidation loan was made); or

"(BB) in the case in which both borrowers request, on the basis of proportions outlined in a divorce decree, court order, or settlement agreement; and

"(II) has the same rate of interest as the joint consolidation loan (as of the date that is the day before such separate consolidation loan is made); and

"(ii) in a timely manner, notify each individual borrower that the joint consolidation loan had been repaid and of the terms and conditions of their new loans.

"(C) APPLICATION FOR SEPARATE DIRECT CONSOLIDATION LOAN.—

"(i) JOINT APPLICATION.—Except as provided in clause (ii), to receive separate consolidation loans under this part, both individual borrowers in a married couple (or previously married couple) shall jointly apply under subparagraph (A).

"(ii) SEPARATE APPLICATION.—An individual borrower in a married couple (or previously married couple) may apply for a separate consolidation loan under subparagraph (A) separately and without regard to whether or when the other individual borrower in the married couple (or previously married couple) applies under subparagraph (A), in a case in which—

"(I) the individual borrower certifies to the Secretary that such borrower—

"(aa) has experienced an act of domestic violence (as defined in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) from the other individual borrower;

"(bb) has experienced economic abuse (as defined in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) from the other individual borrower; or

"(cc) is unable to reasonably reach or access the loan information of the other individual borrower; or

"(II) the Secretary determines that authorizing each individual borrower to apply separately under subparagraph (A) would be in the best fiscal interests of the Federal Government.

"(iii) REMAINING OBLIGATION FROM SEPARATE APPLICATION.—In the case of an individual borrower who receives a separate consolidation loan due to the circumstances described in clause (ii), the other non-applying individual borrower shall become solely liable for the remaining balance of the joint consolidation loan."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 428C(a)(3)(B)(i)(V) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-3(3)(B)(i)(V)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of item (bb);

(2) by striking the period at the end of item (cc) and inserting "; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(dd) for the purpose of separating a joint consolidation loan into 2 separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loans under section 455(g)(2)."

The bill (S. 1098), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, introduced earlier today: S. Res. 679, S. Res. 680, and S. Res. 681.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. KELLY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to; the preambles be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 1057

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Senate receives a message from the House that it has passed H.R. 1057, and if the text of H.R. 1057 as passed is identical to S. 1596, that at a time to be determined by the majority leader or his designee, in consultation with the Republican leader, the bill be considered read a

third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, had there been a recorded vote, I would have voted nay on the confirmations of Executive Calendar No. 990, Joshua D. Hurwit, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years; Executive Calendar No. 991, Gerard M. Karam, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years; and Executive Calendar No. 992, Jacqueline C. Romero, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

120TH ANNIVERSARY OF GAYLORD SPECIALTY HEALTHCARE

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today, I rise to recognize Gaylord Specialty Healthcare as it celebrates 120 years of outstanding service in Connecticut. Throughout its existence, Gaylord has changed with the healthcare needs of the people of Connecticut and indeed across the Nation, while maintaining a reputation for excellence and superior professionalism.

The health system was first founded in 1902 as a tuberculosis sanatorium. Gaylord Sanatorium provided long-term treatment for half a century when the disease was endemic, treating patients including playwright Eugene O'Neill. In 1926, the U.S. Public Health Laboratory National Research Committee selected Gaylord's facilities as the first they used in the country. In 1948, Gaylord Farm Sanatorium was renamed to Gaylord Hospital, restructuring to treat people with chronic illnesses. By 1954, Gaylord Hospital became the first hospital in New England to specialize in comprehensive rehabilitation.

Today, Gaylord Specialty Healthcare is an extensive health system across the State of Connecticut that focuses exclusively on medical rehabilitation. The hospital in Wallingford is a leading center for rehabilitation, and it is one of only two long-term acute care hospitals in the world—and the only one in the United States. Gaylord received certification from the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities in recognition of its outstanding patient care. They offer an extensive breadth of treatment and accreditation opportunities. Gaylord is further certified by the Joint Commission and the

American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation thanks to its exemplary standards.

I have had the privilege of visiting Gaylord Hospital on a number of occasions. This April, I was proud to join members of their staff to celebrate their new physical medicine and rehabilitation physicians residency program, made possible thanks to \$1.2 million in Federal funding. This program will be the first of its kind in Connecticut, and it will play a critical role in ensuring our State has sufficient resources for specialty medical professionals. Having spoken with staff and patients at Gaylord, I can attest firsthand to the extraordinary care, compassion, and expertise demonstrated there. Gaylord Hospital's work is a credit to our State.

As Gaylord Hospital celebrates its anniversary this October, I applaud them on their extraordinary record of accomplishment. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Gaylord Specialty Healthcare on 120 years of excellence. •

REMEMBERING STEPHEN "STEVE" H. SACHS

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, next Tuesday, June 21, there will be a memorial service to honor Stephen H. Sachs, who died on January 12 at his home in Baltimore at the age of 87. Steve Sachs was U.S. Attorney for Maryland for 3 years and Maryland's Attorney General for two terms. He was one of the finest lawyers in the Nation—a proud son of Maryland, a proud son of Baltimore. He was an indefatigable, ever optimistic Orioles fan. He had a brilliant intellect and a sparkling sense of humor.

Steve was born in Baltimore on January 31, 1934. His father was director of the Baltimore Jewish Council and a labor arbitrator, and his mother was a homemaker. Steve received a bachelor's degree in 1954 from Haverford College and then served in the Army from 1955 to 1957. He received a Fulbright scholarship to study at the University of Oxford in England. He received his law degree from Yale Law School in 1960. He worked as a prosecutor in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Maryland. In 1967, then-President Lyndon Johnson appointed Steve as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Maryland, a position he held until 1970.

Steve prosecuted cases involving white-collar crime and public corruption. In 1968, he prosecuted Vietnam war protesters known as the Catonsville Nine, Roman Catholic anti-war activists who broke into the Selective Service office in Catonsville, MD, in an attempt to destroy draft records. It was a high-profile case. The Rev. Daniel Berrigan and his brother, the Rev. Philip Berrigan, led activists on a raid at Draft Board 33 in Catonsville. Steve secured a guilty verdict in Federal

court for destroying government property.

Fifty years later, in a retrospective article in the "Baltimore Sun", Steve wrote with a searing honesty, "I believed then, and believe now, that the nine were brave men and women who acted out of a conviction that the war in Vietnam was profoundly evil. But I believed then, and I believe now, that the conduct of the nine—particularly their insistence that their action at Catonsville should have been condoned because they were 'right'—offends both the rule of law and a fundamental tenet of the American democracy." I think that statement captures Steve's character perfectly.

Steve was in private practice from 1970 to 1978 when he ran an outsider campaign to become Maryland's Attorney General. He didn't align himself with any gubernatorial candidate, which had been the practice. He stated, "The attorney general should be independent. The attorney general should be the people's lawyer." After several public corruption scandals, Marylanders appreciated Steve's unquestioned integrity and were receptive to his activist, reform-oriented campaign. He served two terms as Attorney General and practically reinvented the position. He established a strong Consumer Protection Division within the Office of Attorney General that assisted Marylanders against corporate abuse. As the State's Attorney General, he argued three cases before the U.S. Supreme Court—and won all three. Steve's 8 years as Attorney General overlapped with my service as speaker of the house of delegates, where I had the benefit of Steven's excellent counsel.

In 1986, Steve decided to run for Governor, but he lost the Democratic primary to then-Baltimore mayor William Donald Schaefer. After that defeat, Steve returned to private practice as a partner in the Washington, DC, office of Wilmer-Hale, then known as Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering. He retired from the firm in 1999.

Steve's political career may have officially "ended" when he was just 52, but over the years, he became an elder statesman of Maryland politics. As his former colleagues at Wilmer-Hale said, "Steve was an elegant writer, a powerful advocate and an extremely accomplished trial lawyer. He was a generous partner, colleague and mentor. He taught a generation of lawyers how to write a brief, take a deposition and try a case . . . He was a mensch."

Steve's passion for justice never waned. After he retired from Wilmer-Hale, he joined the Public Justice Center, where he had a significant impact on the development of the center's Appellate Advocacy Project. Steve was a passionate advocate of the civil right to counsel movement, helping to establish the National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel. In 2008, then-Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley appointed Steve to head an independent

review of the Maryland State Police, which had infiltrated activist groups that were lawfully protesting against the death penalty and the war in Iraq.

Steve may be gone, but his legacy is firmly established. Last Friday, I had the honor of attending the investiture of Erik Baron as the first Black U.S. Attorney for the District of Maryland. Erik is just one of Steve's countless proteges carrying on his mission. Erik said, "Steve Sachs was one of the most respected public servants in Maryland's history and a personal mentor to me and many others."

Deuteronomy 16:20 implores us, "Justice, justice you shall pursue . . .". That was Steve Sachs' guiding principle. He did all he could to make the world a better place. It wasn't always easy or comfortable, but he understood the importance of justice under the law. I respected his legal passion, and I am grateful that he shared it with generations of Maryland attorneys as a mentor and a friend. On behalf of the Senate, I send my condolences to his daughter Elisabeth Sachs, his son Leon Sachs, his three grandchildren, and other family members and all those who were fortunate to have him as a friend, colleague, or mentor and mourn his passing.●

REMEMBERING SHERRA FERTITTA

● Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mrs. Sherra Fertitta of Monroe, LA. Mrs. Fertitta leaves behind a legacy of generosity, optimism, and intellect after a remarkable career as a student, educator, and incredibly engaged member of her community.

Mrs. Fertitta was proud to teach for more than 25 years across three States before retiring in 2010 from Ouachita Parish High School. Upon completion of her impressive teaching career, Ms. Fertitta accepted the title of educational director of Vantage Health Plan of Louisiana. Here, she created an educational series via weekly radio interviews with Representative Michael Echols for public health education purposes.

Ms. Fertitta continued her community involvement as a member and core organizer of OPWRC for more than a decade. She spearheaded many projects during her time with OPWRC, including an event during August 2020 that safely provided a forum for Fifth District congressional candidates and voters to interact ahead of the election season amidst a global pandemic.

I extend my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Ms. Fertitta, who have lost an invaluable loved one. Her memory will live on with her children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and all whom she encountered as a dedicated, kindhearted educator.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK KOLE

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH,

Representative MIKE SIMPSON and Representative RUSS FULCHER, we congratulate Pat Kole on his well-earned retirement from serving as vice president, legal and government affairs of the Idaho Potato Commission.

Pat has been a steady hand at the helm of the Idaho Potato Commission, IPC, promoting the iconic Idaho potatoes for more than 25 years. Serving as the IPC's vice president, legal and government affairs, Pat has managed Federal, State, and local government affairs for the IPC, directed its trademark-licensing program, directed its research and education program, and supervised its IT needs. His work has included litigating certification mark cases, registering certification marks in many jurisdictions, testifying before the U.S. Congress and advocating for public policy supporting Idaho potato producers' ability to grow this central agricultural product and feed consumers at home and around the world. To say Pat has gone the extra mile to support Idaho potato production is an understatement, considering in 2005 he ran the Marine Corps Marathon as a representative of the IPC and to help promote the importance of complex carbohydrates, such as those found in Idaho potatoes.

Pat, who earned his undergraduate degree at the University of Michigan and law degree from the University of Denver, has practiced law for more than 40 years. His experience, calm, persistence, and ability to dig into the crux of the problem have been instrumental in facing the challenges that have undoubtedly arisen over the years. This includes his thoughtful advocacy for measured approaches to help with the eradication of the pale cyst nematode, assist producers, and regain markets. More recently, Pat provided critical assistance and advocacy for the needs of Idaho's potato producers as relief efforts were considered for the historic agricultural disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Throughout, Pat's efforts and those of the Idaho potato producers he works with and supports have helped fortify the Idaho potato as a standout symbol of Idaho and U.S. agriculture. It is no surprise Pat has received recognitions for his attentive work. This includes Pat being named The Packer's 2022 Potato Person for All Seasons.

Pat is known as someone who always does his homework and who carefully thinks through the details. That has made him an instrumental partner to us as we work on Federal policy affecting the potato industry. We always know that when Pat raises an issue, he does so with scrupulous grounding, and we know we get a straight and accurate response when we reach out to him for guidance. When policy questions arise that we know will affect the potato industry, Pat is the first we call.

Thank you, Pat, for being such a trusted advocate for the Idaho potato industry all these years and your dec-

ades of service to the Gem State. Congratulations, again, on your retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO ERIC ATKINSON

● Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and recognize Mr. Eric Atkinson of Topeka, KS.

Growing up on a farm outside of Winfield, KS, Eric would listen to the radio at night as his way to stay connected with current events. Captivated by the transmissions that reached him, he became involved with radio in high school, resulting in a lifelong passion for broadcasting. Eric graduated from Kansas State University with a broadcasting degree and worked several jobs in radio, as well as on the family farm, before the opportunity to host "Agriculture Today" arose. He would go on to host the radio program for 39 years, broadcasting over 9,000 shows and interviewing hundreds of agriculture experts and professionals about the issues most relevant to Kansas agriculture.

In the 39 years Eric hosted "Agriculture Today," he made it his goal for the show to serve as a platform for agriculture professionals to share their expertise. He made an effort to ask the most relevant questions and discuss important research topics during his time on air. Throughout his time on the radio, Eric has been credited as an accomplished professional who always worked hard to make sure the issues at hand were easily relatable for farmers across Kansas. His substantial presence in farm truck radios across the State as the host of "Agriculture Today" will continue to be on the hearts and minds of farmers and agribusiness officials.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the wonderful impact Mr. Eric Atkinson has had on the agriculture industry and to honor him for his 39 years of service to Kansas farmers.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRIS LEON

● Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and recognize Mr. Chris Leon of Wichita, KS.

Chris started volunteering for Kansas Honor Flight 8 years ago. Kansas Honor Flight is an all-volunteer organization dedicated to honoring Kansas veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam by sending these heroes on an all-expense-paid journey of honor and remembrance to visit their memorials in Washington, DC. Chris has demonstrated outstanding leadership in his volunteer work with ALLmetal Recycling, and thanks to his efforts crushing aluminum cans, Kansas Honor Flight has been able to send countless veterans on a trip of a lifetime to Washington, DC. Chris is now 31 years old and continues to demonstrate his leadership and support for our veterans through his exemplary volunteer work.

I thoroughly enjoyed meeting Chris on his visit to Washington DC, and I can't wait to see what he accomplishes

in the future. It is my honor to congratulate him, and I hope he knows how much his efforts have contributed to financing the Kansas Honor Flight Program. His deep love for his country and his desire to give back to those who have sacrificed so much are truly an inspiration to us all. I now ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chris for his wonderful accomplishments, as well as in wishing him nothing but success in the future.●

RECOGNIZING THE ANDOVER, KANSAS, YMCA STAFF

● Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and recognize the staff of the YMCA in Andover, KS.

On Friday, April 29, 2022, an EF-3 tornado touched down in Sedgewick County, KS, and left a path of destruction nearly 13 miles long behind. The 165-mile-per-hour winds created by the tornado injured four people and damaged well over 300 buildings in Andover. One of the buildings that sustained heavy damage was the Andover YMCA. The damage done by the tornado would certainly have been much more severe if it wasn't for the quick thinking of the YMCA staff.

I would like to honor and thank the staff of the Andover YMCA who helped save those in the building on the evening of the tornado. As the tornado approached, members of the YMCA staff made announcements on the loudspeakers and helped direct individuals to the safest areas of the building, primarily interior locker rooms. As the tornado hit the building, cars were thrown through walls and windows, with many parts of the building being completely destroyed. The staff working at the YMCA that day saved many lives through their quick thinking to move gym-goers to safety.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Andover YMCA staff, as well as in thanking them for all they did to keep their fellow Kansans safe.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, an-

nounced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 4160. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to grant the Supreme Court of the United States security-related authorities equivalent to the legislative and executive branches.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2773. An act to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7211. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, review a final rule of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 516. An act to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7211. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, review a final rule of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2773. An act to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4302. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Streaked Horned Lark with Section 4(d) Rule" (RIN1018-BE76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4303. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of the Critical Habitat Designation for the Jaguar in Compliance With a Court Order" (RIN1018-AX13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4304. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status with Section 4(d) Rule for Panama City Crayfish and Designation of Critical Habitat" ((RIN1018-BC14) (RIN1018-BD50)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4305. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Adding Rice's Whale to and Updating Three Humpback Whale Entries on the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-BG58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4306. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Big Sandy Crayfish and Guyandotte River Crayfish" (RIN1018-BE19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4307. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Peppered Chub and Designation of Critical Habitat" (RIN1018-BD29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4308. A communication from the Senior Wildlife Inspector, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2022 Inflation Adjustments for Civil Monetary Penalties" (RIN1018-BF67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4309. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Bridge Inspection Standards" (RIN2125-AF55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4310. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Diversion of Highway Revenues; Removal of Obsolete Regulation" (RIN2125-AG04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4311. A communication from the Supervisor, Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, nine (9) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May

26, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4312. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) Program: RFS Annual Rules” ((RIN2060-AV11) (FRL No. 8521-01-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4313. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “ILLINOIS: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions” (FRL No. 9898-01-R5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4314. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program Requirements and Revision of Stage I Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program Requirements” (FRL No. 9701-01-R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4315. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky Area to Attainment of the 2015 Ozone Standard” (FRL No. 9532-02-R5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4316. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 9465-02-R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4317. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District; Correcting Amendment” (FRL No. 9453-02-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4318. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District; Open Burning” (FRL No. 9246-02-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4319. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Determination to Defer Sanctions; Air Plan Approval; California; San Diego County Air Pollution Con-

trol District” (FRL No. 9870-03-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4320. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Ozone and Particulate Matter Controls Strategies” (FRL No. 9439-02-R2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4321. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Montana; Thompson Falls PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 9579-02-R8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4322. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Montana; Whitefish PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request” (FRL No. 9595-02-R8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4323. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Source Specific Changes for Jefferson County” (FRL No. 9775-02-R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 7, 2022; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4324. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Stormwater Infrastructure Funding and Financing”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4325. A communication from the Senior Policy Regulatory Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Paternity Establishment Percentage Performance Relief” (RIN0970-AC85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4326. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “June 2022 Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4327. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to OMB M-22-08, a determination that the Administration does not administer any financial assistance programs for infrastructure as defined under the Act; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4328. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treatment of Amounts Paid to Section 170(c) Organizations under Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of the Further Russian Invasion of Ukraine” (Notice 2022-28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4329. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Temporary Relief from the Physical Presence Requirement Through December 31, 2022, for Spousal Consents Under Qualified Retirement Plans” (Notice 2022-27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4330. A communication from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s 2022 Annual Report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4331. A communication from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s 2022 Annual Report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4332. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 15, 2022; ordered to lie on the table.

EC-4333. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to actions that the President has taken concerning Federal recognition of an international exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4334. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Determination Under Sections 506(a) (1) and 614(a) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Provide Military Assistance to Ukraine”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4335. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of intent to provide military assistance to Ukraine, including for self-defense and border security operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4336. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Annual Information Return/Reports” (RIN1210-AB97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4337. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4338. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4339. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4340. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General’s Semiannual Report for

the six-month period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4341. A communication from the Chair of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4342. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4343. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4344. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4345. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4346. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation Management's Response for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4347. A communication from the Chairman, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4348. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4349. A communication from the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4350. A joint communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4351. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of In-

spector General's Semiannual Report and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4352. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4353. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, Government-wide legislative proposals to strengthen the agility and efficiency of Federal acquisition processes while increasing use of products and construction materials made in America; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4354. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-434, "Fiscal Year 2022 Revised Local Budget Adjustment Temporary Act of 2022"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4355. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-435, "Removal and Disposition of Abandoned and Other Unlawfully Parked Vehicles Reform Amendment Act of 2022"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4356. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-436, "Department of Motor Vehicles Extension of Deadlines Amendment Act of 2022"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Jacquelyn McClelland, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Eric C. Ruttenberg and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Larry D. Watkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 15, 2022.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Michael J. Steffen, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Charles Kirol, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Mark R. Myers, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. David M. Buzzetti, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. David G. Malone, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Charles M. Brown and ending with Capt. Michael Tanner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 15, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Robert J. Dodson and ending with Capt. Michael S. Richman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 15, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. David J. Faehnle and ending with Capt. Kimberly A. Walz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 15, 2022.

Navy nomination of Capt. David H. Duttlinger, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).
Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Eugene D. Black III, to be Vice Admiral.

*Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. William M. Jurney, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Gen. Christopher G. Cavoli, to be General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Richard R. Coffman, to be Lieutenant General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Richard A. Correll, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Col. Michael D. Tomatz, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Thomas E. Ishee, to be Vice Admiral.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Stacey T. Hawkins, to be Lieutenant General.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Kevin B. Kennedy, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Richard L. Kemble, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. John J. Bartrum, to be Major General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Ronald P. Clark, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Patrick D. Frank, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. David W. Abba and ending with Brig. Gen. Parker H. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2022.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Leah G. Lauderback, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Pamela C. Miller, to be Rear Admiral.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Gary M. Brito, to be General.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James B. Hecker, to be General.

Army nomination of Col. Michael J. Deegan, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Mark W. Siekman, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Stuart B. Munsch, to be Admiral.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Darryl A. Williams, to be General.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Dwayne A. Baca and ending with Liana Lucas Vogel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Marc A. Daigle, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Paul E. Boquet and ending with Diana W. Weber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Ivan J. Antosh and ending with D016623, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 4, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with John H. Barkemeyer and ending with Myung Y. Ryu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 2, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Chad C. Black and ending with Matthew D. Wegner,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with George A. Barbee and ending with Cleve B. Sylvester, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph H. Afanador and ending with D011573, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Francis K. Agyapong and ending with Lakisha S. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with George M. Binger III and ending with Timothy M. Zerbe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Laura M. Anderson and ending with Tselane P. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Tyson G. Baynes and ending with James P. Winstead, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Ahrens and ending with D016666, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Chad W. Backus and ending with Frances R. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nomination of Alan R. Boyes, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas S. Furman, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Dustin M. Albert and ending with D016614, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Aaron H. Amano and ending with Nicholas D. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 24, 2022.

Army nomination of Philip J. Botwinik, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Arthur R. Mosel, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Binhminh T. Nguyen, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael R. Hanneken, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Robert J. Belton and ending with Rickie E. Wambles, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2022.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with George H. Forbes III and ending with Ross A. Hrynewych, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 5, 2022.

Marine Corps nomination of Johnathan D. Reed, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Charles E. Knight II, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Joshua C. Lipps and ending with Ryan M. Mudd, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard T. Overkamp, Jr. and ending with Weldon B. Willhite, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Stephan M. Bussell and ending with William P. Phillips, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nomination of Julio E. Patron, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Martin, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew E. Breedlove and ending with Charity C. Hardison, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Ralph E. Hulbert, Jr. and ending with Joseph A. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian C. Arena and ending with Peter J. Zeller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Darren N. Bess and ending with Christopher E. Wear, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Heath J. Brightman and ending with Daniel W. Krowe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nomination of Robert A. Powell, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with James C. Boyt and ending with Anthony G. Matt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nomination of Mitchell R. Jones, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Suzanna G. Brugler and ending with Shivan Sivalingam, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2022.

Navy nomination of Jodi C. Beattie, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Randy J. Berti and ending with Michael Windom, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Joshua E. Calloway and ending with Daniel C. Short, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Darrin E. Barber and ending with Michael A. Woehrman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Benjamin F. Armstrong and ending with Michael H. Sanders, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher J. Carmichael and ending with Marco D. Spivey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Benjamin P. Abbott and ending with Michael K. Witt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Brad A. Bauer and ending with John A. Courtial, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Stephen A. Folsom and ending with Ronnie C. Harper, Jr., which nominations were received by the

Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with David F. Etheridge and ending with Michael K. Sims, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Zeverick L. Butts and ending with Roderick V. Little, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nomination of Peter M. B. Harley, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin D. Barnard and ending with Michael S. Tiefel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Katie M. Abdallah and ending with Ralph J. Stephens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Ron J. Arellano and ending with William M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Erin M. Ceschini and ending with Heather H. Quillenderino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher S. Bernotavicius and ending with Gedion T. Teklegiorgis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nominations beginning with Nathan J. Christensen and ending with Candice C. Tresch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2022.

Navy nomination of Cynthia L. Kane, to be Captain.

Space Force nomination of Andrew S. Menschner, to be Colonel.

Space Force nominations beginning with Paul A. Karsten III and ending with Eric J. Perez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with David A. Beaumont and ending with Nicol R. Stroud, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Wendy M. Delacruz and ending with Eric S. Schlieber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2022.

Space Force nominations beginning with Craig E. Frank and ending with David A. Pheasant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 7, 2022.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4405. A bill to establish a joint task force to improve the collection of restitution and improve oversight of the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Trust Fund Accounts for the purpose of deterring illicit financial activity, money laundering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the use of automatic portability arrangements under defined contribution plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4407. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit exports of crude and refined oil and certain petroleum products to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4408. A bill to prohibit data brokers from selling and transferring certain sensitive data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4409. A bill to prohibit providers of email services from using filtering algorithms to flag emails from political campaigns that consumers have elected to receive as spam; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 4410. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORYN):

S. 4411. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5302 Galveston Road in Houston, Texas, as the "Vanessa Guillen Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and urban Indian organizations to provide safety measures to social workers, health workers, and human services professionals performing services placing such individuals in high-risk and potentially dangerous situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. 4413. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to remove the exclusion of certain small business concerns from the disadvantaged business enterprise program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4414. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to publish a list of hospitals found to be non-compliance with

the hospital price transparency rule; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 675. A resolution commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 676. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 23, 2022, as "National Pell Grant Day"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 677. A resolution recognizing the exemplary service of the soldiers of the 30th Infantry Division (Old Hickory) of the United States Army during World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 678. A resolution recognizing the month of June 2022 as "Immigrant Heritage Month", a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions of immigrants and their children in making the United States a healthier, safer, more diverse, prosperous country, and acknowledging the importance of immigrants and their children to the future successes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORYN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. Res. 679. A resolution commemorating June 19, 2022, as "Nineteenth National Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 680. A resolution designating June 2022 as "National Cybersecurity Education Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 681. A resolution recognizing the service of the Los Angeles-class attack submarine the USS Oklahoma City and the crews of the USS Oklahoma City, who served the United States with valor and bravery; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 111

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 111, a bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Best Practices, and for other purposes.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reauthorize and expand the National Threat Assessment Center of the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 650

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1873, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 2037

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII to strengthen ambulance services furnished under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 2266

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2266, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to improve the safety and security of the Federal judiciary.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, *supra*.

S. 2956

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2956, a bill to advance targeted, high-impact, and evidence-based inventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition, to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2960

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2960, a bill to encourage reduction of disposable plastic products in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 3304

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3304, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of veterans to electronically submit complaints about the delivery of health care services by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3494

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3494, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents to place certain assets into blind trusts, and for other purposes.

S. 3607

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 3607, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 3658

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3658, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

S. 3890

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3890, a bill to improve intergovernmental cooperation and reduce duplicative spending, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 3956

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3956, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a grant program to improve the effectiveness of education and outreach on "Do Not Flush" labeling, and to require the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Administrator, to issue regulations requiring certain products to have "Do Not Flush" labeling, and for other purposes.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4120

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4120, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 4161

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4161, a bill to establish effluent limitations guidelines and standards and water quality criteria for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4192

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4192, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end the tax subsidy for employer efforts to influence their workers' exercise of their rights around labor organizations and engaging in collective action.

S. 4213

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4213, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employers from paying employees in the garment industry by piece rate, to require manufacturers and contractors in the garment industry to register with the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

S. 4245

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4245, a bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers.

S. 4287

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4287, a bill to permit COPS grants to be used for the purpose of increasing the compensation and hiring of law enforcement officer, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 183

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 183, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 427

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 427, a resolution to commemorate the 30-year anniversary of the 1991 Paris Peace Agreements with Cambodia and to call upon all signatories to those Agreements to fulfill their commitments to secure a peaceful, prosperous, democratic, and sovereign Cambodia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4409. A bill to prohibit providers of email services from using filtering algorithms to flag emails from political campaigns that consumers have elected to receive as spam; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, former Google executive chairman Eric Schmidt, in writing with Jared Cohen, once said:

Modern technology platforms [are] even more powerful than most people realize [and that] our future world will be profoundly altered by their adoption and successfulness in societies everywhere.

There is no question that Big Tech plays an ever increasing role in our lives. I imagine most of us wouldn't even be able to count the number of times a day we interact with technology platforms, from checking our email to spending time on social media to searching on Google, and the pandemic only accelerated that trend as our reliance on technology for everything from social connection to food delivery increased.

I don't need to tell anyone that technology platforms offer lots of benefits. They are sources of entertainment and information. They make it easier to stay close to distant loved ones. They allow us to shop, to conduct business, and to connect with friends, and to advocate for causes that we believe in.

But I also don't need to tell anyone that technology platforms have a more problematic side as well. One big problem arises from the increased ability Big Tech has to shape the information we see through the use of opaque algorithms. Gone are the days when you logged into Facebook and just consumed content that had been posted chronologically since your previous login. Now, Facebook and other social media platforms use algorithms to shape your news feed and provide suggestions for additional content, emphasizing posts that the platforms think you will be interested in and deemphasizing other posts.

Now, obviously, algorithms are not all bad. Most of us like it when YouTube automatically plays another video by our favorite band instead of switching to something completely unrelated. But if a 15-year-old kid watches a video and then YouTube's algorithms lead him or her down a path of inappropriate videos—well, I think you could see that is a problem.

A 2021 Wall Street Journal investigation into TikTok revealed how easy it is for young users to be bombarded with inappropriate and disturbing content. And thanks to limited or opaque disclosures, people are often not aware of just how much their experience on technology platforms is being shaped by opaque algorithms.

When we search for something on Google, most of us don't spend a lot of time thinking about the fact that Google is tailoring our search results to what it thinks we want to see or what it wants us to see. But the fact of the matter is that almost all of the information being presented to us by Big Tech platforms like social media and Google is being filtered and tailored to us. And while, again, this can have a positive side, it can also have negative consequences, ranging from political polarization to addictive behavior.

As technology platforms play an ever more dominant role in our lives, I believe platforms should be required to make users aware of the fact that an algorithm is controlling the content they see. To that end, I have offered multiple pieces of legislation to increase Big Tech's transparency and to give consumers more control over their experience.

My bipartisan Filter Bubble Transparency Act would require large-scale internet platforms to notify users that the content they are seeing has been selected for them by secret algorithms, creating a unique universe of information for each user—a phenomenon that is often referred to as the “filter bubble.” Platforms would also be required to give users the choice to switch to a

version of the platform that is filter bubble-free.

I have also introduced the bipartisan Platform Accountability and Transparency Act—or the PACT Act—to shed greater light on the secretive content moderation processes internet platforms use.

The PACT Act would require internet platforms to prepare biannual transparency reports outlining material that they have removed from their sites or chosen to deemphasize. These reports would have to be made available to the public and not in intentionally complicated legalese. Platforms would have to provide clearly understandable versions of these reports to consumers.

The PACT Act would require technology platforms to provide consumers with greater due process when it comes to content these platforms remove or otherwise moderate. So if Facebook, for example, removed one of your posts, it would have to tell you why and would have to provide a way for you to appeal that decision.

Today, I am introducing a third piece of legislation to increase transparency and accountability at Big Tech. This bill is called the Political Bias in Algorithm Sorting Emails Act, otherwise known as the Political BIAS Emails Act. The Political BIAS Emails Act is intended to address the problem political campaigns on both sides of the aisle have faced in getting their campaign emails to Americans.

A recent study from North Carolina State University found that during the 2020 election, Google's Gmail—the largest email provider in the United States—sent greater numbers of Republican campaign emails to spam folders, while Yahoo! and Outlook sent greater numbers of Democratic campaign emails to spam, albeit by lesser margins than Google did for Republican campaign emails. Well, that is a problem.

Americans should have access to political communications from both parties so that they can make their own informed decisions on what candidates they wish to support. Disproportionately filtering out information from candidates of one party—or from a certain candidate within a particular political party, as happened during the Democratic Presidential primary—skews the information available to Americans.

I do not believe that Big Tech should be deciding what information individuals receive. Americans are free to opt out of whatever email communications they wish, including political communications, but Big Tech should not be making that decision for them. My Political BIAS Emails Act would prohibit email services from using filtering algorithms on emails sent from political campaigns where the candidate is running from Federal office.

Gmail and other email services' inboxing practices are a black box to consumers, and they operate with very

little accountability. To address this, my legislation would require email services to submit transparency reports noting the number of emails from both Republican and Democratic campaigns flagged as spam, as well as provide information to political campaigns on request to help ensure that voters are receiving relevant information on every candidate's policy positions.

This legislation would help ensure that Americans and not Big Tech—I emphasize not Big Tech—are making the decisions on what campaign communications they want to receive.

Internet platforms have enhanced Americans' lives in a number of ways, as I have already mentioned. But as these platforms play an ever-greater role in shaping the information we receive, it is vital that we insist on adequate transparency and ensure that Americans are given the opportunity to opt out of the filter bubble. American people ought to be in charge of what they see, not Big Tech companies.

I will continue to work to advance the various bills that I have introduced to promote greater transparency in Big Tech. And as ranking member of the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband, I will continue to focus on ways to ensure that Big Tech is accountable to consumers.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Political Bias In Algorithm Sorting Emails Act of 2022” or the “Political BIAS Emails Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES RELATING TO FILTERING POLITICAL EMAILS THAT A CONSUMER HAS ELECTED TO RECEIVE.

(a) CONDUCT PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for an operator of an email service to use a filtering algorithm to apply a label to an email sent to an email account from a political campaign unless the owner or user of the account took action to apply such a label.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under subsection (1) shall take effect on the date that is 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) QUARTERLY TRANSPARENCY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the first year that begins on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each operator of an email service shall be required to make publicly available, on a quarterly basis, a transparency report that meets the requirements of this subsection.

(2) CONTENT OF REPORT.—Each quarterly report by an operator of an email service required under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The total number of instances during the previous quarter in which emails from political campaigns were flagged as spam.

(B) The number of instances during the previous quarter in which emails from political campaigns were flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm without direction from the email account owner or user.

(C) The total number of instances during the previous quarter when emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Republican Party were flagged as spam.

(D) The percentage of emails during the previous quarter of the year flagged as spam from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Republican party.

(E) The number of instances during the previous quarter in which emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Republican Party were flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm without direction from the email account owner or user.

(F) The percentage of emails during the previous quarter of the year flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm without direction from the email account owner or user for emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Republican Party.

(G) The total number of instances during the previous quarter when emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Democratic Party were flagged as spam.

(H) The percentage of emails during the previous quarter of the year flagged as spam from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Democrat party.

(I) The number of instances during the previous quarter in which emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Democratic Party were flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm without direction from the email account owner or user.

(J) The percentage of emails during the previous quarter of the year flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm without direction from the email account owner or user for emails from political campaigns of candidates belonging to the Democrat party.

(K) A descriptive summary of the kinds of tools, practices, actions, and techniques used by an operator of an email service during the previous quarter in determining which emails from political campaigns to flag as spam.

(3) PUBLICATION AND FORMAT.—The operator of an email service shall publish each quarterly report required under this subsection with an open license, in a machine-readable and open format, and in a location that is easily accessible to consumers.

(c) DISCLOSURE FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, each operator of an email service shall be required to disclose to a political campaign, upon the request of the campaign and subject to paragraph (3), a report that includes any of the information described in paragraph (2) that is requested by the campaign.

(2) CONTENT OF THE DISCLOSURE.—The information described in this paragraph is the following:

(A) The number of instances during the previous quarter when emails from the political campaign requesting the information were flagged as spam.

(B) The percentage of emails sent from the political campaign requesting the information that were flagged as spam during the previous quarter.

(C) The number of instances during the previous calendar quarter when emails from the political campaign requesting the information were flagged as spam by a filtering algorithm.

(D) The total number of emails sent from the political campaign requesting the information that reached the intended recipient's primary inbox.

(E) The percentage of emails sent from the political campaign requesting the information that reached the intended recipient's primary inbox.

(F) A descriptive summary as to why an email from the political campaign requesting the information did not reach the intended recipient's primary inbox.

(3) FREQUENCY OF REQUESTS.—A political campaign may not request that an operator of an email service provide a report containing any of the information described in paragraph (2) more than—

(A) once per week during election years;

(B) twice per month during non-election years; and

(C) once a week in the 12 months preceding the date of a special election in which a candidate associated with the political campaign is seeking election.

(4) BEST PRACTICES.—An operator of an email service shall provide to a political campaign, upon request, best practices on steps the political campaign should take to increase the number of emails from the political campaign that reach the intended recipient's primary inbox.

(5) DEADLINE FOR PROVIDING DISCLOSURE TO POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.—An operator of an email service that receives a request from a political campaign for a disclosure report described in paragraph (1) or best practices described in paragraph (4) shall provide such report or best practices to the political campaign not later than 4 days after the operator receives the request.

(d) ENFORCEMENT BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or a deceptive act or practice under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this section.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(C) AUTHORITY PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Federal Trade Commission under any other provision of law.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FILTERING ALGORITHM.—The term “filtering algorithm” means a computational process, including one derived from algorithmic decision making, machine learning, statistical analysis, or other data processing or artificial intelligence techniques, used by an email service to identify and filter emails sent to an email account.

(2) OPERATOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “operator” means any person who operates an email service and includes any person that wholly owns a subsidiary entity that operates an email service.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—Such term shall not include any person who operates an email service if such service is wholly owned, controlled, and operated by a person that—

(i) for the most recent 6-month period, did not employ more than 500 employees; and

(ii) for the most recent 12-month period, averaged less than \$5,000,000,000 in annual gross receipts.

(3) POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.—The term “political campaign” includes—

(A) an individual who is a candidate (as such term is defined in section 301(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(2));

(B) an authorized committee (as such term is defined in section 301(6) of such Act);

(C) a connected organization (as such term is defined in section 301(7) of such Act);

(D) a national committee (as such term is defined in section 301(15) of such Act);

(E) a State committee (as such term is defined in section 301(15) of such Act); and

(F) a joint fundraising committee that includes any entity described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 675—COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 675

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (referred to in this preamble as “AHEPA”) was founded on July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Georgia, by 8 visionary Greek immigrants to help unify, organize, and protect individuals of all ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds against the bigotry, discrimination, and defamation perpetrated predominantly by the Ku Klux Klan;

Whereas the mission of AHEPA is to promote the Hellenic ideals of ancient Greece, which include philanthropy, education, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence through community service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since the inception of AHEPA, the organization has instilled in the members of AHEPA an understanding of their Hellenic heritage and an awareness of the contributions that Hellenic heritage has made to the development of democratic principles and governance in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas AHEPA has done much throughout the history of the organization to foster patriotism in the United States;

Whereas members of AHEPA have served in the Armed Forces of the United States to protect the freedom of the people of the United States and to preserve those democratic ideals that are part of the Hellenic legacy;

Whereas, in World War II, members of AHEPA parachuted behind enemy lines in Nazi-occupied Greece to help liberate Greece;

Whereas AHEPA raised more than \$253,000,000 for United States war bonds during World War II, and, as a result of the effort, AHEPA was named an official issuing agent for United States war bonds by the Department of the Treasury, an honor that no other civic organization had yet achieved;

Whereas, in 1990, the members of AHEPA donated \$612,000 toward the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, New York, for which AHEPA received special recognition by the Department of the Interior;

Whereas the AHEPA National Housing Program has sponsored safe and dignified affordable housing for vulnerable senior citizens under the Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program (administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and authorized under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q)), and the sponsorship has a portfolio of 4,467 units in 87 communities in 19 States;

Whereas AHEPA has engaged in "Track Two Diplomacy" to foster reconciliation and rapprochement in the Eastern Mediterranean, which is in the best interest of the United States, and has enhanced people-to-people ties between countries;

Whereas AHEPA financially supports scholarships, natural disaster and humanitarian relief, medical research, and countless other charitable and philanthropic causes by contributing more than \$2,200,000 annually from the national, district, and local levels of AHEPA;

Whereas generations of Greek American women and Philhellenes have worked to strengthen society through service organizations, such as the Daughters of Penelope, in order to—

(1) provide affordable housing for older adults;

(2) sponsor and support domestic violence shelters;

(3) provide scholarship awards;

(4) raise awareness and provide financial support for medical research and charitable causes; and

(5) help those in need of humanitarian assistance or natural disaster relief;

Whereas, in the spirit of their Hellenic heritage and in commemoration of the Centennial Olympic Games held in Atlanta, Georgia, members of AHEPA raised \$775,000 for the Tribute to Olympism and Hellenism sculpture, the fan-like structure of which helped to save lives during the 1996 Olympic Bombing at Centennial Olympic Park;

Whereas members of AHEPA raised \$110,000 for the creation of the George C. Marshall Statue erected on the grounds of the United States Embassy in Athens, Greece, in celebration of the historic relationship between the United States and Greece and in tribute to General Marshall, an outstanding statesman and Philhellene;

Whereas members of AHEPA raised \$1,000,000 toward the rebuilding of Saint Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church and National Shrine at the World Trade Center, which was the only house of worship destroyed on September 11, 2001;

Whereas members of AHEPA have been Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States, United States Senators and Representatives, and United States Ambassadors, and have served honorably as elected and appointed officials at local and State levels throughout the United States; and

Whereas President George H. W. Bush cited AHEPA as 1 of the "thousand points of light" in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significant contributions to the United States of citizens of Hellenic heritage;

(2) commemorates the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, applauds its mission, and commends the many charitable contributions of its members to communities in the United States and around the world; and

(3) requests the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 100th Anniversary and many accomplishments of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 676—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 23, 2022, AS "NATIONAL PELL GRANT DAY"

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 676

Whereas June 23 is the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat. 235) by President Richard Nixon;

Whereas that Act established within the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, later named the Federal Pell Grant (commonly known as the "Pell Grant") in honor of its sponsor Senator Claiborne Pell;

Whereas, 50 years ago, Senator Pell stated that "for it's through this Act that the dream of access, and opportunity for college education becomes a reality. It's in this Act that we say a lack of financial wealth should not, and will not, stand in the way of a person who has the talent, the desire and the drive to reach out for a college education.";

Whereas, today, the Pell Grant program, which helps low-income students pursue higher education goals, maintains bipartisan support in Congress and with the public;

Whereas, each year, Pell Grants help nearly 7,000,000 students, approximately 40 percent of undergraduate students, pursue and succeed in higher education;

Whereas Pell Grants help students from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States and from rural areas to cities to everywhere in between;

Whereas the Pell Grant program is well-targeted to meet the needs of students with demonstrated financial need, with the vast majority of Pell Grant recipients having family incomes of \$40,000 or less;

Whereas extensive research shows that the Pell Grant program increases college enrollment and completion among low- and moderate-income students;

Whereas Pell Grants are critical for students from historically underrepresented backgrounds, including 58 percent of Black students, 47 percent of Hispanic students, 51 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native students, 48 percent of first-generation students, 52 percent of students who are parents, and 39 percent of students who are veterans of the Armed Forces;

Whereas each eligible student may use a Pell Grant at the institution of their choice, which includes public, private, 2-year, and 4-year institutions;

Whereas the Pell Grant program is a proven investment to boost future economic mobility, with college graduates paying more in taxes and earning more in after-tax income than high school graduates; and

Whereas, over the past 50 years, the Pell Grant program has helped more than 80,000,000 students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Federal Pell Grant program on June 23, 2022;

(2) expresses support for the designation of June 23 as "National Pell Grant Day"; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to celebrate National Pell Grant Day by—

(A) recognizing the more than 80,000,000 individual low- and middle-income students who have benefitted from the Federal Pell Grant program since its establishment; and

(B) celebrating the success stories of such students, and ensuring the same access for future students.

SENATE RESOLUTION 677—RECOGNIZING THE EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF THE SOLDIERS OF THE 30TH INFANTRY DIVISION (OLD HICKORY) OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY DURING WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 677

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division of the United States Army, nicknamed Old Hickory, was first activated in October 1917 for service in World War I;

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division was nicknamed Old Hickory in honor of General and President Andrew Jackson;

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division was composed of troops from Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina and was instrumental in breaking the Hindenburg Line in World War I;

Whereas, when the 30th Infantry Division was reorganized at Fort Jackson in 1941 for service in World War II, the division included two North Carolina National Guard infantry regiments, one Tennessee National Guard infantry regiment, and other elements;

Whereas Company B of the 117th Regiment of the 30th Infantry Division was composed of members of the Tennessee National Guards from Athens, Tennessee, who also served in World War II;

Whereas Company B was composed of 5 officers and 100 troops, all of whom were from Tennessee;

Whereas 22 of those troops became officers in prominent positions in the Army;

Whereas, in 1940, one year after Nazi Germany invaded Poland to trigger World War II, the War Department reactivated the 30th Infantry Division;

Whereas, in 1944, the 30th Infantry Division was deployed to Great Britain to participate in the planned Allied landing in Europe;

Whereas, after arriving in Europe during World War II, the 30th Infantry Division engaged directly in battle alongside the British armed forces;

Whereas, during World War II, the 30th Infantry Division landed at Normandy on June 14, 1944, participated in the advance across Northern France, joined the invasion of the German Rhineland, defended the Ardennes-Alsace, and fought to the final defeat of Germany in May 1945;

Whereas the 823rd and the 743rd Tank Destroyer Battalions were periodically attached to the 30th Division throughout its campaign in Europe;

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division played a key role in the breakout of the Allied forces from Normandy at St. Lo and the subsequent advance across Northern France;

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division is remembered for its role in the defense of Mortain and St. Barthelmy, France, and Hill 317 against a German counterattack in August 1944, actions in which three infantry regiments of the division (the 117th, 119th, and 120th) and a part of a fourth regiment and other elements of the division participated;

Whereas the 30th Infantry Division also played a key role in stopping the German advance in the Battle of the Bulge and recaptured Malmedy and Stavelot and its vital bridge over the Ambleve River;

Whereas, in March 1945, the 30th Infantry Division crossed the Rhine River and quickly advanced to Madgeburg by April 17;

Whereas, while the 30th Infantry Division moved eastward into Germany, it liberated Weferlingen, a subcamp of the Buchenwald concentration camp, on April 12, 1945;

Whereas, at Weferlingen, the troops found 421 inmates who were in poor physical condition due to malnutrition and in dire need of medical attention;

Whereas representatives of the 30th Infantry Division arranged for mayors of the German towns neighboring Weferlingen to immediately furnish food for the starving inmates;

Whereas, in the report prepared for General Dwight D. Eisenhower rating the American combat units that fought in the European Theater, the Army's official historian, S.L.A. Marshall, rated the 30th Division as first among the infantry divisions that had performed the most efficient and consistent battle service;

Whereas, in 2012, the 30th Infantry Division was recognized as a liberating unit by the United States Army Center of Military History and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum;

Whereas, in recognition of its exemplary service during World War II, the Headquarters Company of the 30th Infantry Division was awarded the Meritorious Unit Commendation and the French Croix de Guerre; and

Whereas the proud fighting tradition of the 30th Infantry Division is perpetuated by the 30th Armored Brigade Combat Team, North Carolina Army National Guard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the exemplary service of the soldiers of the 30th Infantry Division of the United States Army during World War I and World War II.

SENATE RESOLUTION 678—RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF JUNE 2022 AS “IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH”, A CELEBRATION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN IN MAKING THE UNITED STATES A HEALTHIER, SAFER, MORE DIVERSE, PROSPEROUS COUNTRY, AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE IMPORTANCE OF IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN TO THE FUTURE SUCCESSES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 678

Whereas the United States is stronger if all individuals have the opportunity to live up to their full potential;

Whereas about 15 percent of health care workers in the United States are immigrants, including (in order of highest percentage of health care workers who are foreign born)—

- (1) 29 percent of physicians;
- (2) 25 percent of nursing, psychiatric, and home health aides;
- (3) 24 percent of dentists;
- (4) 20 percent of pharmacists;

- (5) 19 percent of dental assistants;
- (6) 15 percent of medical assistants;
- (7) 15 percent of registered nurses;
- (8) 15 percent of licensed practical and licensed vocational nurses;
- (9) 12 percent of dieticians and nutritionists; and
- (10) 12 percent of optometrists;

Whereas the Association of American Medical Colleges attested to the Supreme Court of the United States that the health care system of the United States relies on immigrant health care providers in their current roles;

Whereas immigrants working in health care professions serve throughout the United States and often in rural or underserved communities;

Whereas immigrants fill approximately ⅓ of physician roles in the United States;

Whereas immigrants working in a health care occupation range from those granted temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) or deferred action pursuant to the memorandum of the Department of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” issued on June 15, 2012 (referred to in this preamble as “DACA”) to naturalized United States citizens;

Whereas more than 12 percent of the immigrants working in health care occupations (310,000 individuals) are humanitarian migrants, including refugees, asylees, special immigrant visa holders, and Cuban and Haitian entrants;

Whereas 50,000 DACA recipients perform critical roles in the health care industry;

Whereas the medical students, residents, and physicians who rely on DACA for their ability to practice medicine and provide medical care to approximately 4,600 patients per year;

Whereas, in response to COVID-19, immigrants put their own lives on the line to save lives every day, working as diagnostic and treatment practitioners, physician assistants, physicians, nurses, health aides, nursing assistants and orderlies, health care support workers, medical students and residents, and health technologists and technicians;

Whereas more than 5,200,000 undocumented immigrants, including more than ½ of all DACA recipients (400,000 individuals) and the majority of Temporary Protected Status holders (more than 220,000 individuals) are considered essential critical infrastructure workers;

Whereas immigrant essential workers, including first responders, health care workers, agricultural workers and meat packers, child care providers, and hospitality and transportation workers, have heroically helped provide medical care, food, shelter, and comfort to the individuals of the United States impacted by COVID-19;

Whereas undocumented immigrants alone contribute an estimated \$227,000,000,000 of spending power annually to the United States economy, after the payment of \$49,000,000,000 of combined Federal, State, and local taxes each year;

Whereas the majority of farm workers in the United States are immigrants, and regardless of politics, have been deemed “essential workers” to maintaining a safe food supply for the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas immigrants have served in the Armed Forces since the founding of the United States and have fought in every major conflict in United States history, including the Civil War, World Wars I and II, and conflicts in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq;

Whereas immigrants have put their lives on the line to protect the ideals of the United States and democracy, as well as lives of the people of the United States, by serving as translators and interpreters for the Armed Forces, including in Afghanistan and Iraq, and performing sensitive and trusted activities for United States military personnel stationed with the International Security Assistance Force;

Whereas immigrants who serve in emerging industries with pronounced labor shortages in the United States, such as artificial intelligence, that rely on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (referred to in this preamble as “STEM”) skills, not only bolster the economy but also enhance national security and global leadership;

Whereas, when immigrants have a trusting relationship with local law enforcement agencies, immigrants report crime and work with law enforcement agencies on neighborhood crime reduction strategies;

Whereas the United States has the largest number of immigrants in the world and those immigrants represent almost every country in the world, contributing to the rich diversity of people, cultures, cuisine, literature, art, language, academia, music, media, fashion, and customs;

Whereas the United States is more diverse than ever before in its history, with greater shares than ever before of immigrants from India, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, the Philippines, El Salvador, Vietnam, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, South Korea, and Guatemala, and an increase of more than 90 percent since 2000 of Black immigrants from across the African continent, the Caribbean, Jamaica, and Haiti;

Whereas Black immigrants and their children make up roughly ⅓ of the overall Black population in the United States (21 percent);

Whereas, in response to recent civil unrest in the United States, immigrants of all backgrounds have pledged their support to fight racial injustice, hand-in-hand with Black immigrants, to fight for accountability from law enforcement and the criminal justice system, and to demand that law enforcement protect all individuals, regardless of their skin color;

Whereas celebrating the racial, ethnic, linguistic, and religious differences of immigrants has resulted in a unified, patriotic, and prosperous United States;

Whereas immigration has long been one of the greatest competitive advantages of the United States;

Whereas immigrants of all skill levels have helped make the economy of the United States the strongest in the world, complementing existing businesses in the United States in times of need and founding successful businesses of their own;

Whereas more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or their children, which generate \$4,200,000,000,000 in annual revenue and employ millions of individuals in the United States;

Whereas, although approximately 14 percent of the population of the United States is immigrants, a considerably larger share of the labor force (18 percent) is immigrants;

Whereas immigrants are entrepreneurial, self-starters who create their own opportunity and employment opportunities for others, with 12 percent of employed immigrants being self-employed compared to 9 percent of employed, native-born individuals of the United States;

Whereas immigrant-owned businesses provide jobs across the United States, supporting the creation of additional jobs through entrepreneurial activity in addition to the jobs they fill within their business;

Whereas immigrants are more likely to have advanced degrees than native-born people of the United States;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 international students are enrolled in colleges and universities across the United States, comprising about 5 percent of the total higher education population and helping make the United States the global leader in higher education;

Whereas approximately 100,000 international students each year would hope to stay and work in the United States, if an immigration option were available to them;

Whereas the immigration system of the United States has not been meaningfully updated in nearly 30 years and is now outdated and overburdened, turning away highly skilled workers and international student graduates and putting the global leadership of the United States at risk;

Whereas allowing international student graduates interested in remaining in the United States to secure a permanent immigration status would expand the economy by \$233,000,000,000 during the next decade and would help reduce STEM-related talent shortages by 25 percent;

Whereas national security experts agree that it is essential for the United States to maintain its military exceptionalism by being the leader in advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence, cyber, quantum, robotics, directed energy, and hypersonic weapons, which are all STEM fields where immigrants fill dangerous labor shortages in the United States;

Whereas, due to population aging and longer life expectancy of the population in the United States requiring an increase in health care workers, immigrants are expected to fill a crucial need in the future health care system of the United States essential to keeping the people of the United States healthy;

Whereas, if undocumented individuals who came to the United States as children (commonly referred to as “Dreamers”) alone were provided a pathway to citizenship, they would contribute approximately \$799,000,000,000 to the economy of the United States during the next 10 years;

Whereas future population growth in the United States will require increased immigration, and by increasing immigration substantially, will keep the United States economically competitive with China and other global economies and reduce future fiscal imbalances for popular programs like programs under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.);

Whereas significantly increasing annual immigration levels would double the size of the United States economy by 2050, dramatically lower the ratio of working-age individuals to senior-age individuals, and increase the average income for workers in the United States;

Whereas President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., most recently honored the accomplishments, contributions, and sacrifices of immigrants by proclaiming June 2022 to be “Immigrant Heritage Month” and by asking all people of the United States to observe June 2022 with appropriate programming and activities to remind individuals of the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion; and

Whereas continued integration of immigrants from around the world in a manner that encourages and facilitates a pathway to citizenship, economic and social mobility, and civic engagement will perpetuate the prosperity of the United States and reinforce the patriotism all people of the United States feel for the United States, no matter the color of skin, country of origin, or religious background of the individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes June 2022 as “Immigrant Heritage Month” in honor of the contributions immigrants and their children have made to the United States throughout its history;

(2) pledges to celebrate immigrant contributions to, and immigrant heritages in, each State;

(3) welcomes immigrants presently in the United States and individuals seeking to immigrate to the United States to contribute to the health, safety, diversity, and prosperity of the United States by finding their place in the vibrant, multiethnic, and integrated society of the United States;

(4) encourages the people of the United States to work with their immigrant neighbors and colleagues to advance the current and future well-being of the United States; and

(5) commits to working with fellow Members of Congress, the executive agencies that administer immigration laws and policies, and the President to promote smart and just immigration policy for immigrants presently in the United States, their families, and individuals seeking to immigrate to the United States in the future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 679—COMMEMORATING JUNE 19, 2022, AS “JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY” IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH NEWS OF THE END OF SLAVERY REACHED THE SLAVES IN THE SOUTHWESTERN STATES

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 679

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as “Juneteenth National Independence Day”, as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing Juneteenth National Independence Day for more than 150 years;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day began as a holiday in the State of Texas and is now a Federal holiday and celebrated by individuals in the United States from many walks of life as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates June 19, 2022, as “Juneteenth National Independence Day”;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth National Independence Day to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of Juneteenth National Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 680—DESIGNATING JUNE 2022 AS “NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION MONTH”

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 680

Whereas recent cyberattacks and vulnerabilities present cybersecurity risks to individuals and organizations and increase the urgency to grow and sustain a knowledgeable and skilled cybersecurity workforce in both the public and private sectors;

Whereas, according to CyberSeek.org, as of June 2022, there are 714,548 open jobs in cybersecurity in the United States and 1,091,576 individuals in the cybersecurity workforce;

Whereas a 2017 report entitled “Supporting the Growth and Sustainment of the Nation’s Cybersecurity Workforce: Building the Foundation for a More Secure American Future”, transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Homeland Security, proposed a vision to “prepare, grow, and sustain a cybersecurity workforce that safeguards and promotes America’s national security and economic prosperity”;

Whereas expanding cybersecurity education opportunities is important in order to address the cybersecurity workforce shortage and prepare the United States for ongoing and future national security threats;

Whereas cybersecurity education can—

(1) provide learning and career opportunities for students across the United States in kindergarten through grade 12; and

(2) bolster the capacity of the domestic workforce to defend the United States and secure the economy of the United States;

Whereas, in 2021, Congress authorized, as part of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), the Cybersecurity Education Training Assistance Program (commonly known as “CETAP”), a Department of Homeland Security initiative to provide cybersecurity career awareness, curricular resources, and professional development to elementary and secondary schools;

Whereas CYBER.ORG, a grantee of CETAP, has introduced cybersecurity concepts to more than 3,400,000 students and provided resources to more than 25,000 K-12 educators in all 50 States and 4 United States territories;

Whereas the mission of the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education (commonly known as “NICE”) is “to energize, promote, and coordinate a robust community working together to advance an integrated ecosystem of cybersecurity education, training, and workforce development”;

Whereas cybersecurity education is supported through multiple Federal programs and other related efforts, including—

(1) the NICE Community Coordinating Council;

(2) the Advanced Technological Education program administered by the National Science Foundation;

(3) the CyberCorps: Scholarship for Service Program administered by the National Science Foundation, in collaboration with the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Homeland Security;

(4) the DoD Cybersecurity Scholarship Program administered by the Department of Defense;

(5) the Cybersecurity Talent Initiative administered by the Partnership for Public Service;

(6) the National Centers of Academic Excellence in Cybersecurity administered by the National Security Agency;

(7) the Presidential Cybersecurity Education Award;

(8) Career Technical Education (CTE) CyberNet local academies administered by the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education of the Department of Education;

(9) the GenCyber Program administered by the National Security Agency, in collaboration with the National Science Foundation;

(10) widely used resources, including CareerOneStop, Occupational Outlook Handbook, and O*NET OnLine administered by the Department of Labor; and

(11) the Registered Apprenticeship Program administered by the Office of Apprenticeship of the Department of Labor; and

Whereas ensuring access to cybersecurity education for all students in the United States regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sex, or geographic location will expand opportunities for high-earning jobs in high-demand fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2022 as “National Cybersecurity Education Month”;

(2) invites individuals and organizations in the United States—

(A) to recognize the essential role of cybersecurity education; and

(B) to support Federal, State, and local educational efforts;

(3) encourages educational and training institutions to increase the understanding and awareness of cybersecurity education at such institutions; and

(4) commits to—

(A) raising awareness about cybersecurity education; and

(B) taking legislative action in support of cybersecurity education to effectively build and sustain a skilled cybersecurity workforce.

SENATE RESOLUTION 681—RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF THE LOS ANGELES-CLASS ATTACK SUBMARINE THE USS OKLAHOMA CITY AND THE CREWS OF THE USS OKLAHOMA CITY, WHO SERVED THE UNITED STATES WITH VALOR AND BRAVERY

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 681

Whereas the USS Oklahoma City is a nuclear-powered fast attack submarine named after Oklahoma City, the capital and most populous city in Oklahoma, and is the second ship in the history of the Navy to bear that name;

Whereas the motto of the USS Oklahoma City is “The Sooner, The Better”, which is a testament to both the spirit of the people of Oklahoma City and the readiness of the 140-person crew of the USS Oklahoma City;

Whereas the USS Oklahoma City was christened and launched on November 2, 1985, sponsored by Linda M. Nickles, and was commissioned for service on July 9, 1988, with Commander Kevin John Reardon as the first commanding officer of the submarine;

Whereas, since the commissioning of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City has traveled around the globe multiple times and has served in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Pacific, and, most recently, Apra Harbor, Guam;

Whereas, in the aftermath of the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, the crew of the USS Oklahoma City donated blood in support of the victims of the deadliest act of homegrown terrorism in the history of the United States, which resulted in the deaths of 168 individuals;

Whereas the USS Oklahoma City was the first Navy submarine to transition from navigation using paper charts to an all-electronic navigation suite;

Whereas, on Friday, May 20, 2022, the inactivation ceremony for the USS Oklahoma City was held in Puget Sound Naval Shipyard to honor nearly 34 years of service; and

Whereas, throughout the career of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City supported a range of missions, including anti-surface warfare, anti-submarine warfare, targeted strike missions, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the service of the Los Angeles-class attack submarine the USS Oklahoma City and the crew of the USS Oklahoma City, who served the United States with valor and bravery.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5097. Mr. KELLY (for Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. SMITH)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1098, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5097. Mr. KELLY (for Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. SMITH)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1098, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act”.

SEC. 2. SEPARATING JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 455(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking “A borrower” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A borrower”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) SEPARATING JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) AUTHORIZATION.—A married couple, or 2 individuals who were previously a married couple, and who received a joint consolidation loan as such married couple under subparagraph (C) of section 428C(a)(3) (as such subparagraph was in effect on June 30, 2006), may apply to the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, for each individual borrower in the married couple (or previously married couple) to receive a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part.

“(ii) ELIGIBILITY FOR BORROWERS IN DEFAULT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a married couple, or 2 individuals who were previously a married couple, who are in default on a joint consolidation loan may be eligible to receive a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part in accordance with this paragraph.

“(B) SECRETARIAL REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 428C(a)(3)(A) or any other provision of law, for each individual borrower who applies under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make a separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loan under this part that—

“(I) shall be for an amount equal to the product of—

“(aa) the unpaid principal and accrued unpaid interest of the joint consolidation loan (as of the date that is the day before such separate consolidation loan is made) and any outstanding charges and fees with respect to such loan; and

“(bb) the percentage of the joint consolidation loan attributable to the loans of the individual borrower for whom such separate consolidation loan is being made, as determined—

“(AA) on the basis of the loan obligations of such borrower with respect to such joint consolidation loan (as of the date such joint consolidation loan was made); or

“(BB) in the case in which both borrowers request, on the basis of proportions outlined in a divorce decree, court order, or settlement agreement; and

“(II) has the same rate of interest as the joint consolidation loan (as of the date that is the day before such separate consolidation loan is made); and

“(ii) in a timely manner, notify each individual borrower that the joint consolidation loan had been repaid and of the terms and conditions of their new loans.

“(C) APPLICATION FOR SEPARATE DIRECT CONSOLIDATION LOAN.—

“(i) JOINT APPLICATION.—Except as provided in clause (ii), to receive separate consolidation loans under this part, both individual borrowers in a married couple (or previously married couple) shall jointly apply under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) SEPARATE APPLICATION.—An individual borrower in a married couple (or previously married couple) may apply for a separate consolidation loan under subparagraph (A) separately and without regard to whether or when the other individual borrower in

the married couple (or previously married couple) applies under subparagraph (A), in a case in which—

“(I) the individual borrower certifies to the Secretary that such borrower—

“(aa) has experienced an act of domestic violence (as defined in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) from the other individual borrower; or

“(bb) has experienced economic abuse (as defined in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) from the other individual borrower; or

“(cc) is unable to reasonably reach or access the loan information of the other individual borrower; or

“(II) the Secretary determines that authorizing each individual borrower to apply separately under subparagraph (A) would be in the best fiscal interests of the Federal Government.

“(iii) REMAINING OBLIGATION FROM SEPARATE APPLICATION.—In the case of an individual borrower who receives a separate consolidation loan due to the circumstances described in clause (ii), the other non-applying individual borrower shall become solely liable for the remaining balance of the joint consolidation loan.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 428C(a)(3)(B)(i)(V) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078-3(3)(B)(i)(V)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of item (bb);

(2) by striking the period at the end of item (cc) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(dd) for the purpose of separating a joint consolidation loan into 2 separate Federal Direct Consolidation Loans under section 455(g)(2).”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a classified briefing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

JUNE 15, 2022.

Hon. KAMALA HARRIS,
President of the United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

MADAM: I have the honor to submit a full and complete statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate, showing in detail the items of expense under proper appropriations, the aggregate thereof, and exhibiting the exact condition of all public moneys received, paid out, and remaining in my possession from October 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022, in compliance with Section 105 of Public Law 88-454, approved August 20, 1964, as amended.

Sincerely,

SONCERIA A. BERRY,
Secretary of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2022

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 16; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, postcloture; further, that all time during adjournment, recess, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture, and that all time be considered expired at 11:15 a.m.; further, that upon disposition of H.R. 3967, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Alba and Boyle nominations, and that if cloture is invoked on either nomination, all postcloture time be expired and the confirmation votes occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader or his designee, in consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SULLIVAN and LANKFORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

HONORING OUR PACT ACT OF 2021

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am going to talk a little bit about the bill that we have been debating here all week on the Senate floor, the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our PACT Act of 2022.

Now, it is a very important bill. It is named after Sergeant First Class Robinson, an Ohio National Guard soldier who died in 2022 as a result of service-connected toxic exposure.

This bill that we are going to be voting for final passage on tomorrow would deliver immediate access to healthcare for toxic-exposed veterans, direct the VA to evaluate diseases for presumption of service connection, and streamline the process for toxic-exposed veterans seeking disability compensation for their illness that they gained while serving overseas defending our Nation.

I have supported the intent of this bill for years, and I intend to vote in favor of this bill tomorrow when it comes up for final passage.

There is nothing, in my mind, that is more important than taking care of our veterans, but I do want to raise some concerns about how we got to this point, the process of this bill, which, in my view, undermined the likelihood of this massive new program being implemented in a way that benefits all American veterans so we can take care of all American veterans.

Let me explain. Since my time here in the Senate, I have focused on these issues. I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee that was responsible, in large measure, for many aspects of this bill. I serve on the Armed Services Committee. I still serve in the military myself, in the Marine Corps Reserves, and I am honored to represent the State in our great Nation, Alaska, that has more veterans per capita than any State in the country.

So veterans and military affairs and their families have been a core focus of mine since I arrived in the Senate in 2015. And in particular, I have been focused on this issue of toxic exposure of our service men and women during wartime. In fact, one of my commitments as a candidate for the U.S. Senate in 2014 was to work to ensure passage of the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act, which I cosponsored when I got here and was signed into law in 2019.

That was an outstanding commitment to our Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange during their time, but it was belatedly fulfilled—years, even decades, after their service in Vietnam.

And I took lessons from that. As a matter of fact, I think many Senators took lessons from that, that when the next generation of veterans served overseas and were exposed to toxins during their service, that we needed to act.

So that is what I have done in my career here. I have worked, taking the Vietnam veteran experience, particularly with Agent Orange, to make sure we don't repeat that—the mistakes of Agent Orange where those exposed to toxic substances overseas during their service and later came down with diseases and suffered, that we needed to take care of them.

We know that toxic exposure during military service can add serious complications to a veteran's health, years and even decades after their service has concluded.

And there is science that can correlate certain diseases and symptoms to exposure. That is the model that we want. Veterans suffering from potential exposure understand too well that getting the VA to even recognize and concede exposure can remain a challenging bureaucratic and incredibly frustrating process that leads to denials often from the bureaucracy.

So early in my time here, I have been a relentless advocate on these issues. I will give you a few examples.

I introduced with Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia the Veterans Burn Pits Exposure Recognition Act, which was previously passed out of committee in the Veterans' Affairs Committee and enjoys broad bipartisan support. Close to half of the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—was cosponsors of our bill, and almost all of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee were.

This bill would recognize and concede exposure to toxic substances for those veterans who were deployed in areas where burn pits were in use: in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Uzbekistan—all of these different areas and more.

This bill would do away with the paperwork that made it almost impossible to prove exposure by these veterans. It put the onus on the VA and that bureaucracy.

When crafting this bill with Senator MANCHIN, our offices worked extensively with the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and many of the veterans service organizations, particularly the Disabled American Veterans organization; and we worked with the VA on the language to make sure we were not getting ahead of the science, making sure that what was exposed and what were the diseases connect with science—not always easy, but the VA does have expertise in that area.

I then cosponsored with Senator BLUMENTHAL the K2 Veterans Advocacy Act. This bill moved the needle on three things that are known systematically now: that toxic substances at the base that we call K2 in Uzbekistan, the medical conditions that K2 veterans have—and they are serious; something really bad was going on at the K2 base in Uzbekistan—and the links between the two.

Now, we worked with the Trump White House before President Trump left office in 2020, before our bill passed here on the Senate floor, to get them

to issue an Executive order for the VA to essentially do those things for K2 veterans.

I introduced and had passed the bipartisan Burn Pits Accountability Act with Senator KLOBUCHAR, which directs the Pentagon to include empirical health assessments and evaluation of whether a servicemember has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals in their deployments. This bill was included in the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act.

And I sponsored the Pandemic Care For Burn Pits Exposure Act of 2020 to ensure that servicemembers and veterans with previous exposure to burn pits received the care they needed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

I am listing these bills and the work and time and the bipartisan nature of them because on the Veterans Affairs Committee there has been no issue I have been more focused on.

We are going to take the lessons from Vietnam, Agent Orange, and not say: You are going to wait three or four or five decades while you die of cancer.

And I am committed to this issue, and I have been. But I am also committed to passing legislation that is worthy of all veterans that we are serving. So I have had some reservations about the current bill and the process by which it has come to the Senate floor, because the process has thwarted opportunities to make this a better bill, to make it serve our veterans in a better, holistic way.

And, again, this is an issue I have been focused on since my first days in the U.S. Senate.

So what are the issues?

Well, as I mentioned, some of the things in there—a lot of the things in this bill are very necessary. The bill that I just mentioned that I cosponsored with Senator MANCHIN, the Veterans Burn Pits Exposure Recognition Act, was incorporated into the PACT Act that we will be voting on tomorrow, the Sergeant Robinson Honoring our PACT Act.

In fact, many bipartisan bills from the Veterans' Affairs Committee were included in this bill that we are going to be voting on tomorrow.

But ultimately, what we had going on in the Veterans' Affairs Committee was an agreement that when we brought this big bill—and it is big—to the Senate floor, we would have the ability to bring amendments to try to improve it, to try to make it better for all veterans in the entire VA system, a system that we know has challenges implementing sweeping mandates from Congress.

This is a sweeping mandate from Congress that we are voting on. As I mentioned, the issue of toxic exposure, which I have been focused on since my first year here in the U.S. Senate, has always been a bipartisan bill. Four bills I just mentioned that I have led on have all had Democratic cosponsors leading with me as well. But what hap-

pened this week and last week was the bipartisan nature of trying to tackle one of the biggest issues facing our veterans was shut down. For whatever reason, and I don't know why—somebody should ask the majority leader—all the amendments that we were going to bring to the floor to make this bill better were shut down. We have not had one amendment on this comprehensive bill, and, like I said, a number of us have been focused on this issue for years.

What were we trying to do with these amendments? We are trying to make this a better bill. Bring your ideas to the floor, debate them, vote on them. Why wouldn't we want to do that? Why wouldn't we want to do that? Don't we owe it to all of our veterans to do that?

My primary concern, as I have mentioned, is making sure that not just the constituency impacted by this legislation, which we need—those exposed to toxic exposure primarily from burn pits are taken care of—but that the whole VA system remains robust and strong. And I think some of the amendments—I know some of the amendments that we were going to bring—as a matter of fact, on the Veterans' Affairs Committee there was a commitment to make sure we were bringing these amendments to the floor—would have made this bill better.

What are the biggest concerns? Well, I pressed the Secretary of the VA just yesterday in his testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee on one of the biggest concerns I have and one of the biggest concerns many Senators have and one of the biggest concerns our Veterans' Affairs Committee has, and it is this: This bill that I will be supporting tomorrow is estimated to bring an additional 2.5 million claims to the VA—2.5 million.

My question to the Secretary was simple but really important: Mr. Secretary, is the VA system ready to absorb the roughly 2½ million additional claims that are likely to be generated in the next 3 years by the PACT Act? Are you ready?

We have some ideas and amendments that we think can make it ready. But again, for whatever reason, the majority leader didn't want to hear about those.

In an already stretched VA, with a huge backlog already and challenges as we speak, the Secretary testified about them yesterday, about hiring qualified medical personnel across the country but especially in my State, in Alaska. The concern that I raised with the Secretary yesterday, the concern that we are trying to address with the amendment process here on the Senate floor is this: When you bring that many into a system that is not ready, you can collapse the whole system. You can collapse the whole system.

And then every veteran loses. A young marine with his legs amputated after an IED explosion in Afghanistan who needs help, he is going to be delayed. A Vietnam veteran who needs

care, he is going to be delayed. A Gulf war veteran, she is going to be delayed. If you are collapsing the whole system, every veteran loses. Every veteran loses.

Now, I have actually seen this in my State. And I know the Presiding Officer's State has had some challenges with the VA. Several years ago, I held a field hearing in Arizona on some of the challenges in the VA, but I have seen the system collapse in Alaska. In 2015, my first year in the U.S. Senate, due to legislation that had been passed the year before, we essentially had the system in Alaska collapse. Somehow, some way, legislation and ideas from the VA thought it was really smart to remove the ability to actually make appointments for veterans in Alaska not by officials from the VA who live in Alaska but somewhere in the lower 48—I think it was Louisiana or somewhere—not a good idea. The whole system cratered. I have seen it. And no veteran benefits. No one benefits.

In my first year here in 2015, it was my No. 1 priority to get the VA to fix the broken system in Alaska, and we have made huge progress. But I have seen it firsthand. When a system that is supposed to take care of veterans craters, of course, every veteran suffers.

So we don't want that to happen with the implementation of this important bill. And the Secretary of the VA assured me, assured Senator TILLIS in questioning yesterday, that this won't happen, that the system won't be overburdened, that they are prepared for this.

Well, I hope he is right. I have my doubts, but I hope he is right.

But here is the point: A bipartisan amendment process, particularly from Senators—I will give you one example. Senator MORAN, ranking member on Veterans' Affairs, has been working this issue like me for years. Particularly from Senators who actually know the issue, a bipartisan amendment process would have helped ensure that this possibility would be much less.

I will give you a couple of examples of what, for whatever reason, the majority leader didn't want to bring up on this important legislation. We had amendments to make sure that the VA didn't get ahead of the science. You need to connect the science and exposure to the disease. That is simple. That is what is expected—it is not simple. It is a complicated process, but it is just the rigor of a bill that you want to make sure that those who are exposed and sick and with a disease are the ones who get the care.

Right now, in this bill, there are 23 respiratory illnesses and cancers that will be added to the list of presumptive ailments that will allow a veteran to be diagnosed with toxic exposure and qualify for benefits and any other disease the Secretary of the VA determines is warranted based on a positive association with certain substances, chemicals, or airborne hazards. Some

of those 23 presumptives, as we are calling them, are based on science. Some aren't. I have asked the VA; I have asked the Secretary: Hey, where did we get these 23? The answer, I am still waiting for.

That is what the amendment process is for, to make sure this bill has rigor to take care of all veterans.

Let me mention another amendment offered by Senator MORAN, an amendment that he was promised to get a floor vote on that didn't happen and I think would have made the bill stronger. It would have preserved the Trump-era gains on community care access standards and, importantly, serve as a relief valve for veterans to receive care as millions are going to be added into the system. So, again, if you have 2½ million additional claims and the VA is overwhelmed and now there is a giant backlog for everybody, this amendment would have said: Well, the veterans in the system can go out and get community care. That is a good idea. It is actually how it works in Alaska because we don't have a full-service VA hospital, one of only three States in the country. But that is a really smart idea, a safety valve. If the system looks like it is going to crater because it is overwhelmed, hey, let some doctors in town help the veterans. We couldn't bring that amendment up.

So I pressed the VA Secretary on this because I have seen it when a system collapses, and my veterans were really hurt in Alaska when it did—the VA system in my State. And I am going to take his word for it now that the VA can handle 2½ million more claims in the next 3 years. But I am going to be watching like a hawk—watching like a hawk in my oversight role. Like I said, there is nothing I care more about than our veterans, our military, and their family members. We had the opportunity on an important bill that I will be supporting to make it better. And we sat in the Senate all week and didn't bring up one amendment to even try.

The Secretary is assuring us. OK. All good. Good to go. Well, some of us had ideas to make sure it would have been better to go. We couldn't bring them up.

I hope there aren't problems with this implementation. If the system is in danger of collapsing as a result of this bill, I hope that whoever is majority leader at that time—2, 3, 4 years from now—understands that the care for all veterans is what the VA is all about, and I hope if we need it, we will have the opportunity to bring good ideas to the Senate floor to fix these kind of things because veterans are not a partisan issue in the Senate. They are not. I have seen it my whole career here. I sit on the committee. I sit on the Armed Services Committee. But for whatever reason, our ability, in a bipartisan way, to try to improve this bill that we are going to vote on tomorrow was not granted to other Senators. And I think that was a missed

opportunity because I think we would have made this a better bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The Senator from Oklahoma.

INFLATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to give today's reality check. The Federal Reserve today raised interest rates 75 basis points—three-quarters of a point—with a statement they may come back and do that again in another month.

A point and a half in 2 months is a pretty dramatic effect. It is going to be a situation where many people, 40 and younger, are about to face interest rates they have never faced in their lifetime. The cost of buying a car that is already high is about to get higher. The cost of buying a home that is already really high is about to get much higher.

Inflation is now at 8.6 percent. A lot of people are beginning to feel what that really means. This is not some strange anomaly. This is inflation over the last decade. It has bounced around about the same level, basically, for a decade until right there—March of 2021—and then it just skyrockets at that point.

This is the reality that we are facing at this point. What does inflation really look like when you say it is 8.6 percent? Well, people know what that feels like. The cost of eggs has gone up 32 percent in the past year—32 percent for eggs. The cost of milk is up 16 percent; the cost of butter, also 16 percent; the cost of coffee, 15 percent; the cost of baby formula, if you can find it, is up 13 percent.

And gas prices? Oh, hello. Gas prices—that really has had an effect. This is gas prices since January of 2017. Again, we look, and it stays about the same until January of 2021. I wonder what happened then.

And then look at this.

Then, with the conversation about gas prices that, per the administration lately, has been about, "Well, it is all Putin's fault," well, here are the rising gas prices since President Biden's inauguration—right there—and right there is the war that began in Russia. So this little increase right here is the part that is actually there.

This is our consumer price inflation. This is on gas prices. It is the same thing. To be able to see this flat line on gas prices, that spike—that is the invasion of Ukraine happening right there—and to be able to see what has been added onto it since then. So this is not just about the invasion in Ukraine. This has been ongoing since late January 2021.

The challenge now is, Is this something intentional or is this something accidental? Quite frankly, I think it is a bit of both.

We all remember very well this moment during the Presidential campaign. It was when President Biden was

campaigning, and he walked over to a young lady on the campaign stop and said:

[L]ook in my eyes. I guarantee you . . . we are going to end fossil fuel.

I guarantee you.

That was this moment that happened here.

This was not something totally accidental. It was a drive to say, We have got to shift to solar; we have got to shift to wind; we have got to shift to hydro; we have got to shift to other things; we are going to get rid of fossil fuels; and we are going to accelerate that as fast as possible.

I have to tell you that I live in a State in which we use a lot of wind power. We use a lot of solar power. We use hydropower. We have a very diverse energy portfolio. But right now, the people in my State are paying much higher prices for gasoline, much higher prices for natural gas, and much higher prices for electricity because the policies that have been put in place are driving up the costs, and people feel it.

This is what it looks like at this point. This is the last 24 months of retail average prices—right there, January 2021—and then to be able to see what is happening with prices all over the country.

Now, the administration's response, just in the past couple of weeks, has been this statement.

President Biden has said:

My administration will continue to do everything it can to lower prices for the American people.

I love the words "continue to do" in there. They are going to continue to do everything that they can. They are going to keep doing these things that clearly have driven up prices overwhelmingly for the American people.

It was, let's say, Putin's fault. It has been the oil companies' fault. It has been the refineries' fault. That is the new one that he actually just put out in the last 24 hours—that it is all the fault of the refineries that are just taking in too much profit.

The challenge has been an ongoing attack on American energy from the very beginning. Literally, on day 1, when President Biden canceled the Keystone Pipeline, he started his process of fulfilling his promise that he made during the campaign: "I guarantee you I am going to end fossil fuels." So day 1 was canceling the Keystone Pipeline and getting crude oil from Canada—about 800,000 barrels a day. What he didn't announce on this day is that we still have to have that same 800,000 barrels a day from somewhere because it is heavy crude. We purchase some of our heavy crude from other places, so we still have to get it. His announcement, though, on day 1 was, We are not going to get it from Canada.

What people don't realize is that this announcement on day 1 was, We are not going to get it from Canada. We are going to get it from Russia.

How did that foreign policy work out? Terribly.

On day 1: We are not going to get oil from Canada. We are going to get it from Russia. We are going to get it from other places instead.

He put a moratorium on new Federal oil and gas leasing. That moratorium, by the way, still stays in place in multiple areas, and 24 percent of our oil and gas in the United States comes from Federal lands and waters—24 percent. So what this did was say, for the future of how we are going to develop, we are not going to develop in those areas anymore. I am going to cut off 24 percent of the supply coming in. Again, this goes back to his campaign promise of "I guarantee you I am going to end fossil fuel."

He declined to defend the gulf lease sale 257. That is offshore. Basically, an environmental group went in and sued and said: We don't think they followed the process.

The administration was, like, We are not going to challenge that. We are going to let the environmental group just take this whole thing down, and we are not going to increase our supply of oil coming from the gulf.

He limited the seismic studies necessary for new production in the gulf.

What does that matter?

Well, he has opened up some areas and said: You can drill for more oil in these areas. Oh, but, by the way, you are allowed to do that, but if you want to do seismic testing before you do it—which is a standard that you have to do seismic testing—oh, we are not doing any more seismic testing this whole year. We are not going to allow you to actually prepare a site. We are just going to tell you that you can do it.

That is this mode that the administration is in: Produce more oil, but I am not going to actually allow you to do that with the permitting.

He has failed to implement a 5-year offshore leasing program.

What difference does that make?

By law—by law, now—the administration is required to be able to put a 5-year offshore leasing proposal in place. The current one expires on June 30 of this year. That is days away. There is no present plan in place to be able to replace it.

In fact, I personally asked Secretary Haaland, the Secretary of the Interior, and she said: "We plan by June 30—the deadline to have a new one in place—to be able to put out a comment of what we could do if we do a new plan."

I said: "When will that be complete?"

Her response to me was, "We don't have a deadline as to when that will be complete."

So, what is required by law to have a plan for how we are going to do offshore leasing, they are going to, instead, by the day it should be in place, begin discussing when they might do it in the days ahead.

Again, it goes back to: We are going to talk about it, but we are actually not going to put this lease sale plan in place.

He canceled a lease sale in Alaska's Cook Inlet, which is where oil comes

from. He closed off half of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to any future energy development.

He pushed regulations that would slow or halt a buildout of natural gas pipelines and liquefied natural gas export infrastructure. This is a FERC piece. They actually put a new leader in place in that spot, and then the first action they took was to make putting pipelines that were heading to the gulf to be able to sell natural gas to Europe harder to do and more expensive to do. If we wanted to put natural gas pipelines across our country, he would also make it more expensive and more complicated. So, literally, as the price is going up for natural gas, he has made it even more expensive to be able to transport natural gas and harder to be able to sell it to our allies.

He proposed new financial regulations designed to drive investment for traditional energy projects. This body will remember nominees who were put up by the Biden administration to go to the Federal Reserve who stated out loud that their goal of going to the Federal Reserve was to cut off access to capital for any kind of energy development that was a fossil fuel. They are literally saying: You can't get loans and money to get access to that.

So they will make it harder to actually move it when you get it, if you can get it at all on Federal lands; and they will make it harder to be able to get access to capital.

He has also proposed raising taxes on oil and gas development. Do you remember my comment—or his comment, actually—saying he is going to continue to do everything he can to lower the prices of energy for the American people? Well, what he has actually done is he has proposed a whole new set of taxes on all energy companies. In fact, even recently, there was a conversation about a windfall profits tax on energy companies.

Now, here is the basic economics that this group knows well: If you tax it more, you get less of it. If you get less of it, the price goes up. This is not hard. This is basic economics. Yet this administration has proposed multiple new taxes in their budget that they just put out in the previous month. At the same time, he said: I am going to continue to do what I can to lower prices, at the same time he put out proposals to dramatically increase oil and gas costs.

Nominate anti-traditional energy activists for key posts. We have seen that. He has turned to hostile nations like Iran and Venezuela to meet the U.S. energy demand instead of turning to U.S. producers.

It has been interesting. I have heard several people say: Well, we have got high numbers of production of oil and gas here in the United States. But the fact is, we are still a half a million barrels less now of production than what we were pre-pandemic. We have not caught up on actual production here; and the Biden administration has made it even harder to go get it.

While the Biden administration is planning a trip to Saudi Arabia to talk to them about getting more oil, our friends in Canada are saying: Why don't you come to Canada and talk to us about production? We can increase supply to the United States.

American producers are saying: We can increase supply to the United States if you will lift regulations, allow us to get permits, stop making it harder to move it, stop making it more expensive to get it, and stop adding more taxes onto us. We can produce more in the United States.

Listen, the price of oil right now is about \$117 a barrel. There is plenty of incentive to go get it, but the administration continues to make it harder and harder and harder and more and more unpredictable to actually go get it, so folks are not going to get more. While the Biden administration blames speculators on Wall Street and rich oil companies and everyone else, the basic facts are that the administration's policies are what are driving this problem.

Are there solutions to this? Of course, there are. There are ways to be able to resolve this. We can restart Federal leasing onshore and offshore. I am not talking about having massive rigs everywhere. We do oil drilling and gas drilling better than anyone else in the world.

While the administration is going over to Saudi Arabia to go get oil to be able to use in the United States, don't we think that we produce it cleaner than Saudi Arabia does? What in the world?

If we are going to need to use it, then why aren't we producing it here in the United States? If this is all about a global climate challenge, then why aren't we focused on production here rather than running overseas and trying to be able to get it there?

Restart the permitting process. Restart the leasing onshore and offshore. Stop all of the regulations that are designed to limit and to punish oil and gas production—the administration just did a moratorium on this; it would make a significant difference—actually put in timelines for permitting and litigation.

Again, I have mentioned Canada several times, but if there is a mine that is going in in Canada for things like lithium and other things that we need and the whole world needs—they have deadlines and timelines to be able to do that—it takes about 5 years to be able to do a mine in those areas. It takes 15 years to be able to do that in the United States, if you can get it done at all, because there are no timelines and deadlines.

It is the same thing with the production of oil and gas. When there is this constant litigation challenge all of the time, it makes it more difficult to go get it.

People need to be engaged in the process. The community needs to be heard—Tribes, local governments. Peo-

ple need to be heard and consulted in the process. But with no deadlines out there, there is no incentive to be able to actually go after it.

Promote projects that enhance mutual security like the Keystone Pipeline and like other pipelines. We learned, when there was a security problem on the Colonial Pipeline—coming out last year to North Carolina—and North Carolina suddenly didn't have refined products, gasoline, the whole east coast discovered: We are dependent on one pipeline—one.

If that one pipeline actually has a structural failure, what happens to the east coast? Listen, you can multiply that all over the country.

While this administration fights every pipeline company that is trying to put in a pipeline, they increase our risk of having a major problem and large sections of the country losing access to energy. They are gambling with our future at this point, while we are watching prices exceed \$5 a gallon. Focus on the solutions that don't raise taxes on energy or limit U.S. energy production.

I did have to laugh last week when the President made a speech and said he was working on bringing down the cost of energy. So the announcement was, I am going to bring down the cost of energy by dropping tariffs on solar panels coming from the Far East.

Talk about out of touch. That is out of touch. That is out of touch. Because, if we are going to produce solar panels, then why aren't we incentivizing the production of solar panels here in America rather than encouraging the production of solar panels overseas in the Far East? How in the world is dropping tariffs on solar panels from the Far East going to help folks filling up their tank with gas next week?

The President said he was going to solve energy issues and the price at the pump by increasing the amount of ethanol that we would use. Remember that one? That was about 5 months ago. He said that we would just have more ethanol. He went to Iowa and made a big announcement: We will just do more ethanol. And the prices continue to be able to skyrocket and rise.

The President then came on and said: All right, we still have a higher and higher and higher price. So the ethanol whole thing didn't work when he put that out here, and so he came back and said: We are going to do this Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We are going to release a million barrels a day from this Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Remember that announcement? That announcement was made right about there on this chart. That is when that announcement was made.

How is it going for gas prices since his announcement that we are going to release a million barrels a day from this Strategic Petroleum Reserve? It still continues to be able to rise.

These prices aren't based on short-term input from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. They are based on long-term supply. That is basic economics.

Now the talk has been a temporary gas tax holiday: We will do a temporary gas tax holiday, and that is going to give people relief.

Can I remind everyone that we are over \$5 a gallon? The temporary gas tax holiday would drop the price 18 cents. Eighteen cents is what it would drop the price. We are not trying to get an 18-cent drop. We are trying to get it back to where it was over here, or how about over here, where we were at \$2 a gallon, not 18 cents. Besides the fact, if you drop the price by 18 cents just for this year, it puts a \$20 billion hole in our infrastructure—in our building for bridges and highways and roads—to get an 18-cent bump.

There has also been the proposal out there that he is going to take over refineries. That was today. Again, it seems like every week there is a new thing that they throw out. Now it is a letter that he sent to the major refineries. In the letter that the President sent to the major refineries, he wrote:

[M]y administration is prepared to use all reasonable and appropriate Federal Government tools and emergency authorities to increase refinery capacity and output in the near term . . . to ensure that every region of this country is appropriately supplied.

Great. So the President is going to go into the refineries, and he is going to take them over. The same administration that is managing our baby formula is now going to manage our refineries. That is going to work out terrific.

Our refineries right now are running at 95-percent capacity—95 percent. The interesting thing about our refineries is that America has not built a new refinery since 1977. And just in the past 3 years, we have lost almost a million barrels a day of refining capacity in the United States from refineries shutting down.

Maybe the better question the President could ask is "How do we start increasing our ability to refine," not how is he going to take over refineries and run it himself.

We have a major structural problem right now. This is just evidence of what is going on across the whole economy.

There are answers. There are solutions. But they are not raising taxes, and taking over refineries, and putting oil out from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, or running to Saudi Arabia. That is not going to solve our energy problems.

And I can assure us, we are not going to solve our 8.6-inflation rate until we solve the price of energy, because the price of energy is baked into every single product that we buy—everything. And if this doesn't get solved, this doesn't get better.

Mr. President, do what needs to be done to increase supply in America so that the price will go down. We all believe—we all believe—that, in the decades ahead, we are going to have more electric vehicles; we will have more renewable energy. We all believe that. But 98 percent of the vehicles on the

road right now run on oil and gas, and fulfilling your promise—your promise—that you are going to get rid of fossil fuels right now by making it harder to do pipelines, harder to get capital, harder to do permitting, and more complicated regulations is causing this mess. Thirty years from now, we may all be driving electric vehicles—great. We don't today. Today, we need solutions for how we are going to move in the country. That involves increasing supply. That will get down inflation. That will help us as a nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 16, 2022, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RADHA IYENGAR PLUMB, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ALAN RAY SHAFFER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JULIE D. FISHER, OF TENNESSEE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

CHRISTOPHER T. ROBINSON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

STEPHANIE SANDERS SULLIVAN, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE AFRICAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

THE JUDICIARY

BRADLEY N. GARCIA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, VICE JUDITH W. ROGERS, RETIRING.

DANA M. DOUGLAS, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE JAMES L. DENNIS, RETIRING.

ROOPALI H. DESAI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE ANDREW DAVID HURWITZ, RETIRING.

MARIA DEL R. ANTONGIORGI-JORDAN, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO, VICE GUSTAVO ANTONIO GELPI, ELEVATED.

CAMILLE L. VELEZ-RIVE, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO, VICE FRANCISCO AUGUSTO BESOSA, RETIRED.

GINA R. MENDEZ-MIRO, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO, VICE CARMEN CONSUELO CEREZO, RETIRED.

JERRY W. BLACKWELL, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, VICE SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, RETIRED .

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

VENTRIS C. GIBSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ALAN M. LEVENTHAL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK.